



H. Evaluation Abstract (Do not exceed the space provided)

DETRA was a well conceived training program which more than accomplished its objectives. Originally designed to strengthen firms in the private sector and to increase non-traditional exports, it was modified during the latter stages to conform to newly identified USAID Mission strategic objectives. CNHE was originally contracted to manage the program in the Dominican Republic; it was a natural link to private sector firms. Subsequently, FUNDAPEC was provided a parallel contract to administer training programs directed to the public sector and to non-governmental organizations.

All EOPS indicators were exceeded by the program, including long- and short-term overseas participants and in-country, short-term participants. Initial emphasis was placed on placing graduate degree candidates, because of the length of their programs. Short-term overseas and short-term, in-country training targets were exceeded. The program exceeded targets for HBCU training and training of women. Although the number of off-shore slots for females was not attained, the number of in-country slots was exceeded. Women were less available to participate in programs for private sector firms, because of the dominant presence of men in firms and the competing family responsibilities held by them. In part, level of female participation was explained by sector and type of training, with greater numbers of females participating in health and education programs.

A number of evaluation studies were commissioned during the course of the program. They all indicated that participants and their sponsoring institutions benefitted considerably from the program. They indicated that the program had a measurable impact on career opportunities, salaries and jobs. They also indicated that firms have benefitted considerably through the changes which have been introduced by returned participants.

Project assumptions were mostly verified during the course of the program. A major exception occurred with the key programming tool of the project, namely the Enterprise Training Plan (ETP). ETPs were meant to link the training of individual participants with the needs of their sponsoring firms. The plans were designed to indicate major training needs in the firms, and to suggest corresponding training for participants sponsored by the firms. Cultural and economic factors mitigated against the effective operation of this concept. Most firms lacked a tradition in planning; most tended to think short-range rather than long-range; and most tended to focus on individual rather than institutional needs. The program was slightly modified to take these factors into account, when it was found that this concept was difficult to implement.

Major lessons learned were: (1) that the greatest impact occurred from long-term, overseas training; (2) quality in-country, short-term training is available and can be used to improve the Dominican work force; (3) training should be targeted on economic sectors rather than individual firms because of the fragility of firms and the high intra-sector mobility which exists; (4) ETPs are not appropriate for the Dominican Republic; (5) equity/efficiency concerns permeate training for the private sector; (6) complex management structures reduce program efficiency; and (7) long-term projects benefit from having flexibility built into them, which permits them to adapt to changing circumstances.

It is recommended that (1) future training focus primarily on strengthening the management and sustainability of AID-client organizations, particularly NGOs; (2) USAID should continue to support high impact, long-term, overseas training; and (3) USAID should incorporate strengthening of Dominican higher education institutions into its training activities.

COSTS

I. Evaluation Costs

1. Evaluation Team		Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. \$)	Source of Funds
Name	Affiliation			
Dr. David O. Hansen		P.O.No. 517- 0216-0-00- 5124-00; 30 days	\$18,916	Development Training Project
2. Mission/Office Professional Staff		3. Borrower/Grantee Professional		
Person-Days (Estimate) 7		Staff Person-Days (Estimate) 7		

## A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART II

J. Summary of Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations (Try not to exceed the three (3) pages provided)

Address the following items:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose of evaluation and methodology used</li> <li>• Purpose of Activity(ies) evaluated</li> <li>• Findings and conclusions (relate to question)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principal Recommendations</li> <li>• Lessons learned</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

Mission or Office:

USAID/DR

Date This Summary Prepared:

June, 1995

Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report:

Development Training Proj. Final Evaluation

### Purpose of Evaluation and Methodology:

The main conclusion to be reached, based on this evaluation, is that DETRA has been an excellent training project. It has met original established goals, and training impact on the professional lives of former participants, and on their employer institutions has been considerable. For the participants, impact is manifest in increased salaries, promotions, and greater job mobility. For the employer institutions, it is manifest in greater management capacity, introduction of new computer and information technologies, new administrative procedures, better product marketing, etc. The policy environment for this sector of the economy has been improved through training of personnel from policy organizations, such as the Central Bank and universities.

The purpose of the final evaluation was to measure progress towards achieving project goals and objectives, and to revalidate the project design. The analysis was divided into several major components, including, (a) discussion of background factors which affected the implementation of the project; (b) review of project results; (c) quantitative and qualitative impact analyses; (d) review of project administration; (e) discussion of lessons learned; and (f) recommendations for future USAID Mission training programs.

Data were gathered from several alternative sources, including (1) interviews with USAID Mission personnel, former managers of Dominican Offices responsible for the program, and former participants and their employers; (2) previous program evaluations; and background materials on the project. Previous evaluations included surveys of former participants and their employers. They were designed to assess the impact of training on the professional lives of participants and on the operations of their employers.

### Purpose of Activities Evaluated:

Considerable change occurred in parameters affecting the original design of DETRA. USAID Mission priorities changed over time and the project was adapted accordingly. Initially, the project was targeted on the Dominican private economic sector, and focused on (1) increasing private sector-led export growth; (2) improving firm productivity and efficiency; and (3) increasing the diversification and level of export of non-tradition agricultural products. CNHE was contracted to administer this program, because of its excellent connections with the private sector. FUNDAPEC was also contracted to administer training for the public sector and for non-governmental organizations in 1988.

The project was expanded at this time to include more long- and short-term, off-shore training, and in-country training. Much of this training had little to do with the original project objectives; however, it was consistent with emerging new Mission Strategic Objectives. These objectives were: (a) fomenting increased democratic participation in society; (b) improving health and reducing birth rates; and (c) promoting environmentally sound, equitable economic growth. During its latter stages, DETRA emphasized (1) increased concern with non-economic objectives; (2) short-term, in-country training; and (3) increased attention to training NGO and PVO staff. These changes suggest that this evaluation be conducted in the context of rapidly changing social and economic parameters and the USAID Mission's attempts to adjust to them; and that lessons learned and recommendations will probably relate to training priorities that differ greatly from those found in the original project paper.

C

**Findings and Conclusions:**

Several assumptions were made about conditions under which the project was to be implemented, and were defined in the LOG FRAME for the project. In most cases, these assumptions were robust, and supported project implementation. An important assumption that affected project implementation, and was not included in the original LOG FRAME was that the Balaguer government would continue to give top priority to export of agricultural and other industrial products. This has not occurred. Major assumptions that were not totally valid were (a) Private Sector Firms Want to Reorient Activities [this was less true for established firms which had benefitted from past government protectionist policies, than for new firms]; (b) Political Stability and Economic Growth Will Prevail [this has occurred, but the public sector has been largely abandoned over the life of the project; and many of its functions have been transferred to the private sector, particularly to NGOs and PVOs]; (c) Export Sector will Continue to be Top Priority [this has occurred through tourism and free zones; however, the agricultural and industrial sectors were given less priority by Balaguer]; (d) Private Sector Firms Recognize Need for Training [this occurred, but tended to emphasize training of family members tied to family firms, and to emphasize short-term training, because more problems were in short-term horizon]; (e) Employment Opportunities Exist for Trained Personnel [this has been the case, both with sponsoring firms and with other institutions]; (f) Many Qualified Candidates for Training Exist [this was a valid assumption; however, most of them were not in important positions in private sector firms]; and (g) In-Country Training Capacity is Adequate [this assumption was valid for the project].

The project exceeded its training goals. Long-term graduate training fell a few individuals short, largely because of the failure of some participants to finish their programs. Short-term training exceeded project goals, both off-shore and in-country. In-country training goals were greatly exceeded, with a major emphasis in the health, education and civil society areas. About 47 percent of the trainees were female, with the largest percentage attending in-country programs; and over 10 percent of the off-shore trainees were placed at HBCUs.

The Evaluation Training Plan (ETP) was a key element in the project design. ETPs were intended to link individual training to the strengthening of private and public employer institutions. The training plans were designed to highlight training needs of employer institutions, and to suggest the types of training that were to be provided under DETRA to meet these needs. Public sector institutions and larger firms were more receptive to the ETP than were smaller firms. Smaller and newer firms were more concerned with immediate manpower resource needs and immediate problems. Many of the family owned firms tended to focus on training of family members. Consistent with the Latin culture, there was also a tendency to focus on individual needs and capabilities, rather than on organizational needs. Because of these and other conditions, many employers defined the ETP as an application requirement, rather than as a planning document; many were poorly done; and many tended to focus on individual rather than organizational needs.

Program impact was assessed through surveys of former participants and their employers, which were conducted during the life of the project, and through interviews with former participants, project administrators and employers of participants. These data suggest that the program has resulted in substantial positive impacts on participants and their employers. Participants have improved salaries and experienced job mobility because of the training. Training has been applied in work settings to improve management, administration and production quality and efficiency. These impacts occurred both in the public and private sectors.

Participants indicated that off-shore training was of greater value, because of the impact that it had on their professional formation. While class room learning was important, the principles which they acquired, the contacts they made, and exchanges with other students and faculty had the greatest impact. General training, rather than highly technical training, had the greatest impact. It provided participants with knowledge about alternative markets and product development, as well as principles of management and administration. This knowledge was more easily applicable over a variety of areas. Off-shore training also appears to have had a consistently greater positive impact on employers, participant careers and project target objectives.

Project administration was generally responsive, goal oriented, and user friendly. USAID/GDO maintained good relations with CNHE and FUNDAPEC -- the local management entities. These entities established and maintained excellent relationships with appropriate institutions in Dominican sectors relevant to DETRA. DAI provided technical assistance to CNHE, including local assistance in identifying, orienting and placing participants, and placement and logistical support for off-shore trainees. Some problems emerged with both placement and in-country technical assistance. With regard to placement, participants complained that their were not placed in institutions of their choice. DAI indicated that its placement of participants was conditioned by supporting documentation and cost factors. Participants also complained about poor pre-departure support from the DAI representative in the Dominican Republic.

#### Principal Recommendations:

Several recommendations that are relevant to future training activities of the USAID Mission are found below.

- USAID should maintain a portfolio of overseas training, particularly long-term training, because it results in greatest impact on national economic and social development.
- USAID should incorporate activities which strengthen higher education institutions into in-country training programs. Substantial quality, in-country training capacity currently exists. This should be nurtured to increase the magnitude of training investments.
- Increased attention should be given to strengthening administrative, managerial and sustainability dimensions of Dominican NGOs and PVOs which participate in the current USAID project portfolio. These institutions require this training in order to become sustainable over time.

#### Principal Lessons Learned:

- Training Impact is Directly Related to the Amount of Funding Invested in it.
- High quality In-Country Training Capacity is Available.
- Training Should be Targeted on Economic Sectors rather than on Specific Institutions/Enterprises.
- Enterprise Training Plans do not Work Well in the Dominican Republic.
- Equity/Efficiency Parameters Determine Different Types of Training Programs.
- Complex Project Management Structures Reduce Program Efficiency and Create Additional Work for other Participating Institutions.
- Long-term Projects Require Design Flexibility to Facilitate Adaptation to Changing Circumstances.

## ATTACHMENTS

K. Attachments (List attachments submitted with this Evaluation Summary; always attach copy of full evaluation report, even if one was submitted earlier; attach studies, surveys, etc., from "on-going" evaluation, if relevant to the evaluation report.)

Copy of the full Evaluation Report: Three copies in English.

## COMMENTS

L. Comments By Mission, AID/W Office and Borrower/Grantee On Full Report

The Development Training Project has achieved and exceeded its training goals. It has succeeded in meeting its purpose of improving the human resource base required for the private sector growth and development, and to improve both public and private sector institutions efficiency and productivity.

Program impact was assessed through surveys of former participants and their employers. These surveys revealed that the project resulted in substantial positive impact on the participants and their employers. Participants improved their salaries and experienced job mobility because of the training received, and employers reported improved management, administration and production quality and efficiency.

This project also succeeded in complying, and exceeding, the WID component and the Mission's HBCU's requirement. The counterpart contribution required under this project was also exceeded.

In overall, this project has successfully achieved its goals, and proved that training has a sensible impact when applied to a definite sector of the economic development.

X D - ABL - 802 - A

FINAL EVALUATION  
DEVELOPMENT TRAINING PROJECT  
517-0216

Prepared by  
Dr. David O. Hansen  
The Ohio State University

June, 1995

\* This report was prepared under a direct contract between the consultant and the USAID Mission, Santo Domingo.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I owe the content of this evaluation report to many individuals and institutions. All of them provided me with objective information about program activities and accomplishments. I am especially grateful to the USAID Mission staff who provided me with the necessary Mission orientation to training efforts and the logistical back stopping which made my sojourn a pleasant and rewarding experience. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Mr. Michael Deal, Deputy Mission Director, who took time out of his busy schedule to provide me with the appropriate orientation toward the project. Ms. Christine Adamczyk and Amelia Ramirez also spent considerable time providing me with background for the evaluation, caring for logistics related to my assignment, and providing me with opportunities to socialize after hours. Mr. Roberto Liz, Executive Director of FUNDAPEC and Dr. Francisco J. Castillo, President of CNHE, gave of their valuable time and provided me with important insights into the project. I am also very grateful to Ms. Carmen Salce and Mr. Rafael Alba, respectively former managers of the CNHE and FUNDAPEC Offices, for taking the time to meet with me and to share their insights into the project. To all of the above and to many unnamed contributors to DETRA, thank you for helping me in my evaluation effort; and thank you for helping DETRA make important development training inputs to the Dominican economy and society.



OUTLINE	<u>Page</u>
<b>A. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION</b>	1
<b>B. BACKGROUND FACTORS AFFECTING THE PROJECT</b>	2
1. Changes in the Dominican Economy	2
2. Project Design/Expected Outcomes: Modifications	3
3. Project Implementation: A Review	4
4. Project Assumptions	5
<b>C. PROJECT RESULTS: AN OVERVIEW</b>	8
1. Project Numerical Accomplishments (EOPS Indicators)	8
2. Enterprise Training Plans	10
3. Distribution of Training by Type, Sector and Gender	12
4. Local Currency Component	16
<b>D. IMPACT ANALYSIS</b>	19
1. Surveys	19
a. Summary of Results from Four Follow-up Surveys	19
i. Employment Status	20
ii. Occupational Mobility	21
iii. Applicability of Training	24
iv. Job Performance	26
v. Investment Return	27
vi. Salary Increases	27
b. Detailed Analyses from 1993 Survey	29
i. Sector of Employment	29
ii. Type of Training	32
iii. Place of Training	35
iv. Nature of Training	37
2. Case Studies	41
a. CNHE	41
i. Ramon Mejia	41
ii. Sergio Grullon	42
iii. Grace Rivera	43

<b>OUTLINE (CONTINUED)</b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
b. FUNDAPEC	44
i. Evaydee Perez S.	44
ii. Luis B. Reyes	46
iii. Cristina Thomen	47
<b>E. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION</b>	48
1. U.S. Agency for International Development [USAID]	48
2. National Council of Businessmen [CNHE]	49
3. Foundation APEC [FUNDAPEC]	49
4. Development Associates	49
<b>F. LESSONS LEARNED</b>	53
1. Expense of High Impact Training	53
2. Availability of High Quality In-Country Training	53
3. Target Training to Economic Sectors	53
4. Enterprise Training Plans Inappropriate	54
5. Equity and Efficiency Parameters not Always Compatible	54
6. Avoid Complex Project Management Structures	55
7. Long-Term Project Designs Need Flexibility	55
<b>G. RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	55
1. Preference to Long-Term and Overseas Training	56
2. Incorporate Institutional Strengthening into Training	56
3. NGO Administration, Management and Sustainability	56
<b>H. APPENDIX</b>	57
1. Scope of Work for Evaluation	58
2. DETRA Logical Framework Matrix	63
3. Reference Documents	66
4. Persons Interviewed	69
5. Interview Questionnaire Used	72

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Purpose of Evaluation and Methodology:

The main conclusion of this evaluation is that DETRA has been an excellent training project. It has met established goals, and training impact on the professional lives of former participants, and on their employer institutions have been considerable. For the participants, impact is manifest in increased salaries, promotions, and greater job mobility. For the employer institutions, it is manifest in greater management capacity, introduction of new computer and information technologies, new administrative procedures, better product marketing, etc. The policy environment for this sector of the economy has been improved through training of personnel from policy organizations, such as the Central Bank and universities.

The purpose of the final evaluation was to measure progress towards achieving project goals and objectives, and to revalidate the project design. The analysis was divided into several major components, including, (a) discussion of background factors which affected the implementation of the project; (b) review of project results; (c) quantitative and qualitative impact analyses; (d) review of project administration; (e) discussion of lessons learned; and (f) recommendations for future USAID Mission training programs.

Data were gathered from several alternative sources, including (1) interviews with USAID Mission personnel, former managers of Dominican Offices responsible for the program, and former participants and their employers; (2) previous program evaluations; and (3) background materials on the project. Previous evaluations included surveys of former participants and their employers. They were designed to assess the impact of training on the professional lives of participants and on the operations of their employers.

### Purpose of Activities Evaluated:

Considerable change occurred in parameters affecting the original design of DETRA. USAID Mission priorities changed over time and the project was adapted accordingly. Initially, the project was targeted on the Dominican private economic sector, and focused on (1) increasing private sector-led export growth; (2) improving firm productivity and efficiency; and (3) increasing the diversification and level of export of non-tradition agricultural products. CNHE was contracted to administer this program, because of its excellent connections with the private sector. FUNDAPEC was also contracted to administer training for the public sector and for non-governmental organizations in 1988.

The project was expanded at this time to include more long- and short-term, off-shore training, and in-country training. Much

of this training had little to do with the original project objectives; however, it was consistent with emerging new Mission Strategic Objectives. These objectives were: (a) fomenting increased democratic participation in society; (b) improving health and reducing birth rates; and (c) promoting environmentally sound, equitable economic growth. During its latter stages, DETRA emphasized (1) short-term, in-country training; (2) increased concern with non-economic objectives; and (3) increased attention to training NGO and PVO staff. Changes suggested that the evaluation be conducted in the context of rapidly changing social and economic parameters and the USAID Mission's attempts to adjust to them; and that lessons learned and recommendations should relate to training priorities that differ greatly from those found in the original project paper.

### **Findings and Conclusions:**

Several assumptions were made about conditions under which the project was to be implemented, and were defined in the LOG FRAME for the project. In most cases, these assumptions were robust, and supported project implementation. An important assumption that affected project implementation was not included in the original LOG FRAME. It was assumed that the Balaguer government would continue to give top priority to export of agricultural and other industrial products. This has not occurred. Other important assumptions were that: (a) Private Sector Firms Want to Reorient Activities [this was less true for established firms which had benefitted from past government protectionist policies, than for new firms]; (b) Political Stability and Economic Growth Will Prevail [this has occurred, but the public sector has been largely abandoned over the life of the project; and many of its functions have been transferred to the private sector, particularly to NGOs and PVOs]; (c) Export Sector will Continue to be Top Priority [this has occurred through tourism and free zones; however, the agricultural and industrial sectors were given less priority by Balaguer]; (d) Private Sector Firms Recognize Need for Training [they tended to emphasize training of family members tied to family firms, and to emphasize short-term training, because most problems were in need of rapid solutions]; (e) Employment Opportunities Exist for Trained Personnel [this has been the case, both with sponsoring firms and with other institutions]; (f) Many Qualified Candidates for Training Exist [this was a valid assumption; however, most candidates were not in important positions in private sector firms]; and (g) In-Country Training Capacity is Adequate [this assumption was valid for the project].

The project exceeded its training goals. Long-term graduate training fell a few individuals short, largely because of last minute changes in plans by candidates and changes M.S. programs in the U.S. Both off-shore and in-country training exceeded project goals. In-country training goals were greatly exceeded and tended to focus on health, education and civil society development. About

47 percent of the trainees were female, with the largest percentage attending in-country programs; and over 10 percent of the off-shore trainees were placed at HBCUs.

Evaluation Training Plans (ETPs) were key to the project design. ETPs were intended to link individual training to the strengthening of private and public employer institutions. The training plans were designed to highlight training needs of employer institutions, and to suggest the types of training that were to be provided under DETRA to meet these needs. Larger firms were more receptive to the ETP as were public sector institutions. Smaller and newer firms were more concerned with immediate manpower resource needs and immediate problems. Many of the family owned firms tended to focus on training of family members. Consistent with the Latin culture, there was also a tendency to focus on individual needs and capabilities, rather than on organizational needs. Because of these and other conditions, many employers defined the ETP as an application requirement, rather than as a planning document; many were poorly done; and many tended to focus on individual rather than organizational needs.

Program impact was assessed through surveys of former participants and their employers, which were conducted during the life of the project, and through interviews with former participants, project administrators and employers of participants. Survey data suggest that the project has resulted in substantial positive impact on participants and their employers. Participants have improved salaries and experienced job mobility because of the training. Training has been applied in work settings to improve management, administration and production quality and efficiency. These impacts occurred both in the public and private sectors.

Participants indicated that off-shore training was of greater value, because of its impact on their professional formation. While class room learning was important, the principles acquired, the contacts made, and the exchanges with other students and faculty had the greatest impact. General training rather than highly technical training had the greatest impact. It provided participants with knowledge about alternative markets and product development, as well as principles of management and administration. This knowledge was more easily applicable over a variety of areas. Off-shore training also appears to have had a consistently greater positive impact on employers, participant careers and project target objectives.

Project administration was generally responsive, goal oriented, and user friendly. USAID/GDO maintained good relations with CNHE and FUNDAPEC -- the local management entities. These entities established and maintained excellent relationships with appropriate institutions in Dominican sectors relevant to DETRA. Development Associates, Inc. (DAI) provided technical assistance to CNHE, including local assistance in identifying, orienting and

placing participants, and placement and logistical support for off-shore trainees. Some problems emerged with both placement and in-country technical assistance. With regard to placement, participants complained that they were not assigned to institutions of their choice. DAI indicated that its placement of participants was conditioned by supporting documentation and cost factors. Participants also complained about poor pre-departure support from the DAI representative in the Dominican Republic.

#### **Principal Recommendations:**

Several recommendations that are relevant to future training activities of the USAID Mission are found below.

- USAID should maintain a portfolio of overseas training, particularly long-term training, because it results in greatest impact on national economic and social development.
- USAID should incorporate activities which strengthen higher education institutions through in-country training programs. Substantial quality, in-country training capacity currently exists. This should be nurtured to increase the magnitude of training investments.
- Increased attention should be given to strengthening administrative, managerial and sustainability dimensions of Dominican NGOs and PVOs which participate in the current USAID project portfolio. These institutions require this training in order to become sustainable over time.

#### **Principal Lessons Learned:**

- The Impact of Training is Directly Related to the Amount of Funding Invested in it.

Overseas, long-term training has the highest impact, but is by far the most expensive. This type of training impacts on the professional formation of participants as well as on their technical performance. Principles and general orientation to professional and to work environments, which were acquired during training, had important long-term effects on their careers and on their employer institutions.

- High Quality, In-Country Training Capacity is Available.

Local institutions provided excellent training under DETRA. This was more true of courses which lasted for one week or more. These courses were strengthened, as were the sponsoring institutions, by the incorporation of appropriate international personnel into the course offerings.

- **Training is Best Targeted on Economic Sectors rather than on Specific Institutions/Enterprises.**

Considerable job mobility occurred among participants upon return from their training. This was most notable for those who undertook long-term and overseas training. In some cases, their sponsoring institutions went out of business. In other cases, they provided returned participants with unsatisfactory jobs. Participants found that they had highly valued and marketable skills upon return. Many responded to more attractive job offers.

Most of the mobility which occurred, however, took place within the same economic sector in which training was provided. For example, some Central Bank-sponsored participants took jobs with private banks; some professors of agriculture took jobs with agribusiness firms; and some NGO employees took jobs with firms in the same sector. Future training should focus on manpower resource needs of sectors, rather than firms, to facilitate this type of job mobility, while at the same time, maximizing returns from investments in training.

- **Enterprise Training Plans do not Work Well in the Dominican Republic.**

Alternative organizational approaches to training in the Dominican Republic should be considered and implemented. Many of the firms participating in the training were small and relatively new. They had limited capacity to complete good training plans. Training candidates took charge of preparing more of the ETPs, and incorporated their own personal training preferences, rather than the needs of the sponsoring firms, in them.

Several additional limiting factors were: (1) that there is less of a tradition of working with training plans in the Dominican private sector; (2) that many firms are family owned and operated, and desire primarily to send family members for training; (3) many private sector firms are on shaky economic footing, and are concerned with solving short-term problems rather than long-term problems; and (4) that in the Latin American culture, a tendency exists to focus on individual rather than organizational needs.

As a result of these conditions, many firms defined the ETP as an application requirement rather than as a planning tool; many were poorly done, and therefore of marginal use in defining training needs; and many tended to focus on needs of participants rather than needs of employers.

- **Equity/Efficiency Parameters Determine Different Types of Training Programs.**

Programs that are designed to provide training to private sector firms, in order to strengthen them, are more likely to

emphasize efficiency goals. Programs that are not designed to provide institutional strengthening are more likely to emphasize equity goals. Private Sector firms, particularly family owned and operated firms, are more likely to support the overseas training of family members, who will later become managers and decision makers in the firms. These individuals are more likely to be of middle or upper class origin. However, training of these individuals is more likely to lead to higher payoff for the firms. These participants are more likely to return after training and they are more likely to remain with the sponsoring firm.

Short-term training, particularly in-country training, is more likely to incorporate individuals of lower economic means. This training places fewer economic demands on sponsoring institutions, and the training is more accessible to individuals who may have no formal affiliation with institutions in the private sector.

- **Complex Project Management Structures Reduce Program Efficiency and Create Additional Work for other Participating Institutions.**

DETRA had two in-country management entities -- CNHE and FUNDAPEC. Operationally, this implied that USAID duplicated its management and oversight responsibilities. This resulted in additional monetary and personnel management costs. Management costs were primarily borne by the General Development Office and the Controllers Office. In part this structure resulted from shifts in USAID Mission priorities. CNHE was originally contracted to access the private sector, consistent with project objectives. When training was also shifted to the public and NGO sectors, there was a need to define an intermediary that worked with these sectors. A subcontract arrangement, using only one primary contractor, could have avoided some of the additional cost and management burdens.

- **Long-term Projects Require Design Flexibility to Facilitate Adaptation to Changing Circumstances.**

DETRA was designed as an eight year project. Many changes occurred in the Dominican economy, and in AID priorities while it was being implemented. These changes led to changes in the focus of training. Adaptation to the changing circumstances would have been less difficult, if greater flexibility had been introduced to the project design. It may be appropriate in the future to tie training to Mission Strategic Objectives and to specific projects. This would permit resources to flow in forms that are consistent with changing priorities.



**BODY OF REPORT**

## A. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

A final evaluation of the USAID/Dominican Republic's Development Training Project (517-0216) [DETRA] is presented in this report. The Scope of Work for this assignment (See Appendix) indicated that the project should be assessed at two levels, namely, (1) achievement by trainees of their specific objectives for using the training in the employer organization, and (2) resulting changes in the organization that contributed to the project goals. In the report, attention is given to the project's impact on individual participants and their employer institutions. However, it also focuses on project strategy and design, in the context of changing priorities within the USAID Mission and the Agency for International Development in general.

The focus is on informing about how general training projects can be improved in the future, particularly in an era of declining resources. The primary concern is to contribute to future training strategies, and the design of projects to meet them.

This is a formidable task, given the changes which occurred in USAID Mission priorities during the life of the project, and the corresponding changes which were introduced into it. Initially, it was targeted on the Dominican economy, especially improvement of its efficiency and production of high quality products. Specific objectives were (1) to increase private sector-led export growth; (2) to improve firm productivity; and (3) to increase agricultural diversification. It began with a single contract with the Dominican National Council of Businessmen (CNHE). It was subsequently amended to include participation by the Foundation APEC (FUNDAPEC). Funds allocated to FUNDAPEC were to be used specifically to train individuals from the public sector and from Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs).

Amendment #4 to the Project Paper increased the number of evaluations of DETRA from two to three. However, the final evaluation objectives remained the same, namely, to measure progress towards achieving project goals and objectives, and to revalidate the project design. The analysis in this report will enable the reader to do so. However, it will also shed light on appropriate training strategies in light of declining resources and shifting priorities within USAID.

The report is organized so that sections naturally flow in sequence. It begins with a review of background factors, including major changes which have occurred in the Dominican economy during the life of the project. The setting which gave birth to DETRA is also briefly reviewed. This is followed by a brief discussion of competing priorities which emerged in the USAID Mission, and priorities which may emerge during the coming five years. The second section contains a review of project results. This section is divided into two parts. In the first part, patterns of training

provided are discussed; and in the second part, the impact of the project on the former participants and employer institutions is assessed, and factors which are related to this impact are discussed. This section is based on data from previous surveys of participants. The following section focuses on project administration. It includes discussion of the performance of different entities involved in the conduct of the training. The final section contains a discussion of lessons learned from the project. This section focuses on principles which should guide future project design and execution.

## **B. BACKGROUND FACTORS AFFECTING THE PROJECT**

Information provided in this section is intended to give the reader an overview of factors which impacted on the project design and implementation over its life time. The period of 1986 to 1994 was a period of transition in the Dominican economy which ramified directly on its social structure and society. Modifications of the original design were in part an attempt to address these changes.

### **1. Changes in the Dominican Economy**

The underlying rationale for DETRA was that changing circumstances made it imperative that Dominican firms increase their levels of efficiency and product quality, in order to be able to compete in international markets. Substantial changes in the nature of the economy made this imperative. In the agricultural sector, the disappearance of preferred market quotas for sugar, coffee and other traditional export crops signalled a need to shift to non-traditional exports. However, markets for these products were also highly competitive. Many Dominican firms had a limited capacity to survive in highly competitive international markets. The problems which they faced resulted, in large part, from import substitution policies pursued by the Dominican government, which were themselves a legacy of policies advocated by Raul Prebisch and other policy experts associated with the Economic Commission for Latin America. These policies were directly challenged during the decade of the eighties by an oil crisis and by a burgeoning foreign debt. In response to this crisis, the Dominican government turned to the International Monetary Fund and other international lenders, which discouraged further adherence to these antiquated policies.

Attention then became increasingly focused on the generation of foreign currency through increased exports. However, it was recognized that many enterprises, that had significant potential export markets, were not geared up to take advantage of this opportunity. Most were inefficient and failed to adhere to high quality standards. They needed to overcome several major shortcomings in order to contribute to the balance of payments. Their diversification and ability to compete in international markets

were contingent on obtaining new technical expertise, new modes of production, distribution and marketing, improved management and administrative capacity, and increased knowledge about international markets and how to access them. Initially, DETRA was designed to help them overcome these shortcomings.

The initial project focus was on increasing export capacity. This was defined as managerial and technical capacity. Managerial weaknesses were identified in business administration, production management and banking, particularly as it relates to trade and export finance. The agribusiness sector was defined as a major contributor to exports, particularly in non-traditional exports. In agriculture, manpower shortages were identified in mid-level management, agribusiness administration, agronomy, food technology and product design. Technical manpower shortages were also identified in other sectors of the economy, including industrial electronics, food processing, graphic arts and industrial design.

The latter training related to the quality of production in the free zones, which had been set up in major cities in the country. These free zones, along with tourism, became the major sources of export earnings. The free zones, of course, produced products that had a guaranteed market. Tourism was able to avail itself of relatively cheap labor, thus competing favorably with other Caribbean nations. Free zones also benefit from this relatively inexpensive labor.

## **2. Modifications in Project Design and Expected Outcomes**

The project experienced several major modifications, that were reflected in project amendments, during its nine year life. In 1988 DETRA was expanded to include training needs of firms and other private sector participants not involved in exports, as well as public sector institutions and NGOs which could support private sector-led export activities. However, they also were supporting improved health and social services. This signaled a shift toward addressing equity issues, and the increased inequality and poverty in Dominican society which occurred during the recession of the mid-eighties. In sum, this amendment expanded the universe of institutions that were eligible to receive training support, and the scope of training activities. It was a response to evolving circumstances surrounding the project and USAID Mission priorities. The amendment also stipulated that numerous less costly, highly accessible in-country training courses be conducted.

Since 1990, the USAID mission has spent a considerable amount of time and energy redefining its strategic objectives and corresponding organizational structure. By 1993, it had defined its strategic objectives as (1) fomenting increased democratic participation in society; (2) improving health and reducing birth rates; and (3) promoting environmentally sound, equitable economic

growth. These strategic objectives deviated considerably from mission priorities in 1988 when DETRA began. The latter stages of DETRA were dominated by (1) short-term, in-country training; (2) decreased concern with the economic growth objective; and (3) increased attention to training staff from Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs).

This cursory review of the changes which occurred during the life of the project suggest two important points to bear in mind about the following analysis. First, DETRA must necessarily be evaluated within the context of rapidly changing social and economic factors, and the attempt by USAID to adjust the training project to them. Second, lessons learned and recommendations which result from the analyses will undoubtedly relate to training priorities that differ greatly from those found in the original DETRA Project Paper.

### 3. Project Implementation: A Review

In August, 1986, USAID and the National Council of Businessmen (CNHE) signed a grant agreement under which CNHE was given the responsibility to implement DETRA. CNHE established a management office and immediately initiated selection of candidates for off-shore training, to be preceded by English language training.

Development Associates, Inc. was given a four year contract to provide technical assistance to the contract in July, 1989. Prior to this, the USAID Mission worked directly with CNHE in the identification, preparation and placement of participants. The AID/Washington Office of International Training and its principal subcontractor - Partners in International Education and Training (PIET) - facilitated placement and monitoring of participants in the U.S. Once its contract was in place, DAI assumed these advisory roles with CNHE.

CNHE awarded a \$300,000 sub-grant to Partners of the Americas to manage training in the U.S. Training was to consist of 4 M.S. degrees and 30 short courses. Three M.S. programs were initiated and 34 short-term participants were trained. The grant period was originally three years, but was extended for 7 months to allow M.S. participants to complete their degree programs. Trained participants under this subagreement are included in CNHE aggregate figures.

Two years after its initiation, the DETRA project was substantially modified. The original project was enlarged by the addition of another eight million dollars, and the extension of its closing date to August, 1994. At this juncture, USAID also provided a grant of 4.2 million dollars to the Foundation APEC (FUNDAPEC) to manage training activities. Another 3.8 million dollars was added to the CNHE grant. FUNDAPEC was given the

responsibility to design and support training activities for public sector entities and for PVOs and other NGOs similar to those designed by CNHE for private sector entities. DAI did not provide technical assistance to FUNDAPEC.

The types of training to be provided by FUNDAPEC were similar to those being provided through the grant to CNHE. FUNDAPEC was also expected to select and place participants in graduate degree training programs and in appropriate short-term, non-degree training programs in the U.S. and other countries. A portion of the supplemental funds were also to be used by CNHE and FUNDAPEC to contract for short-term, in-country training. CNHE was given 975 thousand dollars to contract for 54 of these courses, and FUNDAPEC was given 450 thousand dollars to contract for 32 of them. The Development Associates contract was also amended in January, 1990 to continue provision of technical assistance to CNHE and FUNDAPEC.

FUNDAPEC and CNHE received additional funding in Dominican pesos from the Technical Secretariat of the Presidency (STP) to promote additional short-term, in-country training. During the period, July, 1992 to August, 1994, FUNDAPEC received an additional \$1,845,500.68 pesos. These funds were used for short-courses in health and population, project formulation and development planning, education, and agriculture and natural resources. CNHE was provided with an additional \$1,152,070.99 pesos to arrange for similar types of in-country training.

#### 4. Project Assumptions

DETRA was designed to stimulate increased export growth and economic development. This was to be accomplished by providing appropriate training to private sector firms that could be involved in future export activity, and to public sector entities which help facilitate export activity. The Logical Framework Matrix for the project outlined several important assumptions upon which the model was based. In large measure, they have proven to be valid. They are briefly reviewed below.

An assumption which did not appear in the Logical Framework Matrix was perhaps for the success of the project as those discussed. This was that the government would continue to give top priority to the export of agricultural and other industrial products as a source of foreign exchange. This in fact did not occur. In fact, the two leading sectors of the Dominican economy, as regards foreign exchange earnings, are tourism and free zone production. These have been given high priority by the Balaguer government. As a consequence, the potential of agricultural and industrial sectors to contribute to foreign exchange earnings through exports has not been fully realized.

**ASSUMPTION: Private Sector Firms Want to Reorient Activities**

Many firms demonstrated a desire and capacity to reorient their activities. This was most evident in the agricultural and textile and artisan sectors. Others introduced new management and organizational systems, based on computer technology. Older, more established firms were less likely to make these changes. They have established systems and benefitted in the past from government protectionist policies. Their ability to survive under GATT is a moot question.

**ASSUMPTION: POLITICAL STABILITY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH WILL PREVAIL**

The Dominican Government has essentially been stable since 1965. Political stability has impacted positively on economic growth and private firm development; and has encouraged foreign firms to invest in the country.

However, much of the public sector has been abandoned during the past decade. Many of the functions of government agencies have been taken up by private sector entities, including a myriad of relatively new NGOs and PVOs. The shift in focus from the government sector to the private sector has resulted in declines of government salaries and morale; and in substantial transfers of qualified personnel from public to private sector jobs, particularly to the NGOs and PVOs. The ability of these institutions to provide needed inputs in research, education and teaching, and to otherwise transfer goods and services to less privileged strata of society has been seriously jeopardized. In recent years, these functions have been largely usurped by the NGO and PVO communities.

**ASSUMPTION: EXPORT SECTOR WILL CONTINUE TO BE TOP PRIORITY**

The current government administration has given top priority to tourism, free zones and the construction sectors. These sectors have prospered, and the first two have become the major earners of foreign currency. However, this also resulted in reduced contributions by the industrial and agricultural sectors to national development. To a certain extent, this impacted negatively on DETRA's goal. Although not foreseen when the project was designed, the recent signing of the GATT agreement by the Dominican government will require export industries to substantially upgrade their quality control, operational efficiency, and ability in order to compete effectively in international markets. These will in turn depend in large measure on additional training of their personnel.

**ASSUMPTION: PRIVATE SECTOR FIRMS RECOGNIZE NEED FOR TRAINING**

Most firm managers recognize the need to upgrade work force skills, and they are willing to make investments, depending on the type of training. Most recognize a need for specific skill

training related to the work place. Most also agreed that long-term training was necessary, particularly for current and/or for future executives. However, they disagreed regarding who should receive long term training. Family firms preferred to train one of their own, since they anticipated that they would be future leaders of these firms.

Most firms approved of short-term training, as a means to improve job performance. They preferred in-country training to off-shore training because it involved less time away from the firm, and offered greater possibilities of understanding how the training could be applied on the job.

**ASSUMPTION: EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES EXIST FOR TRAINED PERSONNEL**

Long-term trainees should have been employed for a period of not less than one year prior to being proposed for fellowships; and the assumption was that they would continue to be employed by their sponsors upon return. This implied that employment opportunities existed for long-term trainees. Surveys of returned trainees indicated that they had many employment opportunities upon return; and that many had actually changed employment.

**ASSUMPTION: MANY QUALIFIED CANDIDATES FOR TRAINING EXIST**

Both CNHE and FUNDAPEC identified qualified candidates for off-shore training. Some variation in numbers existed by institution and sector. One major problem with the program design was the assumption that occupants of key positions in the firms would be available for training under the project. Many of the trainees did not originate from these positions, nor did they return to them.

The total pool of candidates turned out to be somewhat smaller than was originally anticipated, particularly for long-term degree training. Many private sector firms are small and employ few people who would qualify for this training. Many firms could not afford to release appropriate candidates, or they were unable to cover counterpart costs associated with training.

**ASSUMPTION: IN-COUNTRY TRAINING CAPACITY IS ADEQUATE**

In-country training was generally of high quality and germane to local problems. CNHE polled members about needs to be met by training. FUNDAPEC relied on newspapers and public sector informants. Organizations which provided the training were mostly selected through open competition. Both CNHE and FUNDAPEC solicited proposals and selected the best ones for each short course. Training was conducted at various facilities, including the university campuses, local hotels and government facilities.



## C. PROJECT RESULTS: AN OVERVIEW

### 1. Project Numerical Accomplishments (EOPS Indicators)

End of Project Status Indicators for DETRA are found in Table 1. They have varied, depending on the stage of the project. The figures presented are those which correspond to the entire project including all of the amendments. Only total figures for graduate degree training, short-term, off-shore training, and short-term, in-country training are found in the official literature. For purposes of analysis, these figures were broken down by gender.\* The gender goals presented for CNHE assume 40 percent female participation, while those presented for FUNDAPEC assume 25 percent female participation. These figures were assigned to each of the project management organizations. No explanation was ever given for the disparity. Suffice it to say that, when aggregate figures are used, the project met the 40 percent female participation goal. Indeed, of the 18,973 participants, 8,940 were women. This represents slightly over 47 percent of all participants.

CNHE exceeded its overall project training goal by slightly over 1 percent, having arranged for the training of 2,844 participants. Data in Table 1 indicate that this is due to greater programming of participants for short-term, in-country training. Using aggregate figures, about 33 percent of the participants selected by CNHE were women. This figure is lower than the 40 percent figure assigned to CNHE. On the other hand, it is considerably above the 25 percent figure assigned to FUNDAPEC. In part this may reflect the nature of the training arranged by CNHE. Most of it was directly related to business matters; and women participate less actively in this sector of the economy than do men in the Dominican Republic. About 35 percent of the participants in in-country programs were women while only about 28 percent of off-shore participants were women. In part, this may reflect the fact that it is easier for women to participate in in-country training. Many have family responsibilities, including tending for children in addition to their work place responsibilities. It is easier for them to satisfy both when participating in in-country training.

Data in Table 1 also indicate that FUNDAPEC greatly exceeded its overall project goal of 980 participants. In large measure, this was due to the nature of the training provided. FUNDAPEC fell about 9 percent short of its goal for graduate degree training. However, it entered the program several years after CNHE, and had less time to program graduate degree participants. This programming had to be completed with sufficient time to ensure that

---

\* A more complete analysis of training by content area is found in a later section of this report.

Table 1: Summary of Training Goals and Training Provided

National Council of Businessmen						
Type of Training	Male		Female		Total	
	Goal**	Output	Goal	Output	Goal	Output
Graduate Degree	65	71	42	34	107	105*
Short-Term Off-Shore	369	450	246	165	615	615
Short-Term In-Country	1,266	1,374	818	750	2,084	2,124
Total.....	1,700	1,895	1,106	949	2,806	2,844
Foundation APEC						
Type of Training	Male		Female		Total	
	Goal***	Output	Goal	Output	Goal	Output
Graduate Degree	34	28	11	13	45	41
Short-Term Off-Shore	102	117	33	87	135	204
Short-Term In-Country	600	7,990	200	7,894	800	15,884
Total.....	736	8,138	244	7,994	980	16,129

\* Includes 6 Participants of Partners of the American Program

\*\* Assumes Goal of 40% of All Participants

\*\*\* Assumes Goal of 25% of All Participants

the participants completed their program prior to August, 1994, which was the project termination date. Three participants are still in the process of completing their degrees. FUNDAPEC placed over 50 percent more participants in short-term, off-shore programs than was originally programmed. The biggest difference in output versus programmed goals was for in-country participants. In all, 15,884 individuals participated in these in-country short courses, workshops and seminars. Most of the participants attended training related to health issues, particularly AIDS, and democratic processes. The latter training was offered in support of civil service reforms.

Differences in participation by women in different types of training programs are similar to those found for participants placed by CNHE. As for graduate degree training, 32 percent of those placed were women. Women participants in off-shore training represent about 44 percent of the total. About as many women as men participated in in-country training programs. This may in part be explained by the nature of the training provided, particularly that related to health education and democratic processes.\*

## 2. Enterprise Training Plans

Enterprise Training Plans (ETPs) were a fundamental design tool of the organizational approach found in DETRA. DETRA was designed to strengthen firms, with the assumption that they are the key units involved in promoting private sector economic growth, especially through increases in non-traditional exports. It was assumed that greater training impact would result from this focus. ETPs linked individual training to the strengthening of firms. ETPs were designed to demonstrate how training would shore up key management and technical deficiencies of firms.

ETPs were designed to screen institutions, because they were a precondition for participation in long-term training. Only employees of firms presenting ETPs were eligible for training. They highlighted training needs for the firms, and by inference, the types of training that were required for employees to satisfy these needs. By inference, they also identified the types of individuals that needed the additional training. Most of the training related to ETPs was long-term, overseas training.

The strengths and weaknesses of this approach were amply discussed in the two previous evaluations of DETRA (Renforth, 1990; Hansen, 1993). However, they bear further discussion because of their potential salience for future education and training projects, including future attempts by USAID to strengthen NGOs.

---

\* Gender variations in participation rates are further discussed in a following section.

Numerous problems were initially encountered in preparing ETPs. A major factor which led to these problems was the limited planning capacity of the firms. Most were small and were relatively new. Many were family firms, which were headed by individuals who had little or no appreciation for long range planning, particularly as it relates to human resource needs. Given the small size of many of these firms, they had limited capacity to prepare the ETPs. These problems were less evident in public institutions which entered the program with the signing of a contract with FUNDAPEC in 1990. Many of these public institutions had planning departments and had already prepared human resource development plans.

To get around the fact that few firms were coming forth with ETPs, CNHE encouraged candidates for training to pressure their employers to spend the necessary time on ETPs and to provide them with required support during training. This approach increased the number of ETPs received. The down side to this approach was that it encouraged individuals with weaker ties to firms to initiate the process. They often helped define training programs that met their individual needs, but not necessarily the greatest needs of the sponsoring firms.

Several factors worked against the use of the firm level approach and the use of highly structured training plans. They may be more common to countries which are less developed economically, and in which organizational discipline is less evident.

- In the Dominican Republic, there appears to be less of a tradition of preparation and use of manpower training plans. Furthermore, many firms are new and have never worked with training plans.
- Many are family owned and operated. If these firms are to make long-term investments in training, they probably will center them around family members, who are expected to be decision makers, if they are not so already. These will not be economically disadvantaged individuals.
- Most private sector firms are not on solid economic footing. They are concerned with the short-term, rather than the long term, and they are inclined to seek short-term solutions to immediate problems. Manpower investments, particularly in training, are likely to focus on immediate needs, rather than the long-term needs implied by ETPs.
- In the Latin American culture, there is a tendency to focus on individual needs and capabilities, rather than on organizational needs. This augurs against the use of ETPs based on organizational needs.

As a result of these conditions, the ETPs were not as effective as they were designed to be.

- Many firms, NGOs and public institutions defined them as an application requirement, rather than a planning document. Many received little or no input from organizational leaders.
- Many were poorly done, failing to provide important information, to identify adequately firm level constraints, and training required to address the constraints.
- Training plans for small, family owned firms tend to focus on the needs of individuals rather than those of the firm. Many of these firms had few candidates for training.

### 3. Distribution of Training by Economic Sector

Table 2 summarizes the distribution of training by economic sector. Data are further broken down by gender in order to assess the relevance of economic sector to training potential by gender. Differences in sectors to which training was directed by CNHE and FUNDAPEC reflect in part the orientation of these institutions and in part changes in the project as it evolved. CNHE is devoted primarily to meeting the interests of the business community in the Dominican Republic. The original design of the project contemplated dealing only with this sector. FUNDAPEC entered the project a little over two years after its initiation, and its participation was oriented towards serving the training needs of government institutions and NGOs. Its mandate within Dominican society was to support education across sectors.

#### A. CNHE

Data on the distribution of training managed by CNHE indicate that it was all provided in three sectors: (1) Economy/Finances; (2) Agriculture; and (3) Industrial/Management. These sectors are directly related to the original general objective of DETRA, namely to promote increased productivity and efficiency of firms, particularly as they relate to promotion of non-traditional exports. The bulk of graduate degree training was related to the industrial/management sector. This represented 80 percent of all long-term training. Another 13 percent of this training was provided in the general economy/financial sector. Over a third of the trainees in both of these sectors were women. The remaining 7 percent of the long-term training was provided in the agricultural sector. All of this training was provided to men. Women were most frequently provided industrial/management training (88%).

The distribution of specialized, off-shore training was similar to that for long-term training. A majority (58%) of this training was directed to the industrial/management sector. Fifty percent of the men received training in this area as compared to 76

Table 2: Distribution of Training by Economic Sector and Gender

	<u>National Council of Businessmen</u>					
	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Off-Shore, Long-Term</u>						
Health/Population	--	--	--	--	--	--
Economy/Finances	10	14	4	12	14	13
Education	--	--	--	--	--	--
Agriculture	7	10	--	--	7	7
Democracy	--	--	--	--	--	--
Industrial/Management	54	76	30	88	84	80
Subtotal.....	71	100	34	100	105	100
<u>Off-Shore, Short-Term</u>						
Health/Population	--	--	--	--	--	--
Economy/Finances	54	13	23	12	77	12
Education	--	--	--	--	--	--
Agriculture	160	37	23	18	183	30
Democracy	--	--	--	--	--	--
Industrial/Management	213	50	142	76	355	58
Subtotal.....	427	100	188	100	615	100
<u>Short-Term, In-Country</u>						
Health/Population	--	--	--	--	--	--
Economy/Finances	94	7	74	11	168	8
Education	--	--	--	--	--	--
Agriculture	379	28	80	11	459	23
Democracy	--	--	--	--	--	--
Industrial/Management	869	65	543	78	1,412	69
Subtotal.....	1,342	100	697	100	2,039	100

Table 2: Distribution of Training by Economic....(Continued)

	Foundation APEC					
	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
<u>Off-Shore, Long-Term</u>						
Health/Population	1	4	2	16	3	8
Economy/Finances	7	25	5	38	12	29
Education	7	25	3	23	10	24
Agriculture	13	46	3	23	16	39
Democracy	--	--	--	--	--	--
Industrial/Management	--	--	--	--	--	--
Subtotal.....	28	100	13	100	41	100
<u>Off-Shore, Short-Term</u>						
Health/Population	3	13	13	15	16	8
Economy/Finances	36	30	44	51	80	39
Education	63	53	28	33	91	44
Agriculture	17	14	1	1	18	9
Democracy	--	--	--	--	--	--
Industrial/Management	--	--	--	--	--	--
Subtotal.....	119	100	86	100	205	100
<u>In-Country, Short-Term</u>						
Health/Population	3,964	40	2,191	25	6,145	33
Economy/Finances	361	4	222	3	583	3
Education	421	4	931	10	1,352	7
Agriculture	172	2	22	--	194	1
Democracy	4,964	50	5,612	62	10,576	56
Industrial/Management	3	--	12	--	15	--
Subtotal.....	9,875	100	8,990	100	18,863	100

percent of the women. Agriculture was the next most common sector of training. However, unlike industrial/management, men were twice more likely than women to have received training in it. Only 13 percent of the trainees in this area were women. Women and men were as likely to have received training in economy/finances. Less than one sixth of all specialized overseas training was provided in this area.

The pattern of short-term, in-country training roughly parallels that for short-term, off-shore training. Both men and women were most likely to have received this training in the industrial/management area. Over three-fourths of the women were trained in this area as were about two-thirds of the men. Agriculture was the next most frequent area of in-country training. Twenty-eight percent of the men received training in this area as did 11 percent of the women. Less than 10 percent of all in-country training was in economy/finances.

Data in the table suggest that the most popular area of off-shore and in-country training, was industrial/management, while the second most popular was in agriculture. This is in keeping with the project objectives. Industrial/management training was most likely to lead to increased productivity and efficiency; and agricultural training was the most likely to lead to increases in non-traditional agricultural exports.

#### **B. FUNDAPEC**

Data on economic sectors in which training was emphasized by FUNDAPEC demonstrate a notable contrast with the above. There is a much greater emphasis on health, education and democratic strengthening. Also, it is apparent that women participated with greater frequency in FUNDAPEC-managed training. In part this reflected the areas in which training was provided.

Long-term training was primarily directed to agriculture and the economy/finances which were areas also emphasized by CNHE. A review of the FUNDAPEC-managed portfolio of training, long-term training indicates that it was most consistent with the original objectives of DETRA. Men were twice as likely to be trained in agriculture as were women. Unlike CNHE-managed training, about one-third of the long-term scholarships were slotted for health and education.

The relative importance attributed to education was greater for specialized, off-shore training. Close to two-thirds of the male participants and about a third of the female participants received specialized training in this area. However, over half of the female participants received specialized training in economy/finances.



The greatest deviation of training from original project objectives occurred for in-country training. Almost all of this training was targeted for health and democratic strengthening. The health training dealt primarily with the topic of AIDS prevention; the democratic strengthening dealt primarily with civil service reform. Although not tied to the original project objectives, this training was justified under the rationale that it was directly tied to Mission Strategic Objectives. Data indicate that about two-thirds of the women who received in-country training received it in democratic strengthening, while a fourth received it in health. Health training was primarily provided to women teachers and NGO employees, who were considered to be trainers of trainers. Democratic strengthening training provided to government employees, many of whom were women. Data confirm that over twice as many women received in-country training than did men. This again reflects the predominance of women employed in this sector of the economy.

Several summary statistics regarding FUNDAPEC-managed training merit repeating. First, almost 99 percent of all individuals trained received in-country training. Fifty-six percent of this training was in democratic strengthening. Another 33 percent was in health; and only 11.4% was in other areas, primarily education. This training represented the major deviation in programmed training from original project objectives. It occurred during the latter stages of the project, and was consistent with redefined Mission Strategic Objectives.

#### **4. Local Currency Component**

As part of the Development Training Program, the Technical Secretariat of the Presidency (STP) agreed to use AID-counterpart funds to support additional in-country training. This training was to be administered by CNHE and FUNDAPEC. The initial obligation was for 4.2 million pesos. STP provided both intermediary institutions with loans of up to \$2,000,000, which were to be turned into grants upon successful completion of the training. The initial loan agreements between FUNDAPEC and STP, and between CNHE and STP were signed in late 1991. Over the years, the initial agreements were amended as more funds were provided to the agreements.

Both programs are considered by USAID to have been satisfactorily completed. Each intermediary institution used slightly over half of the funds allocated to them for actual training. The training provided is described in the following section, as are several problems which occurred with each intermediary organization during the life of the program.

##### **A. National Council of Businessmen (CNHE)**

Training under the STP Agreement were initiated in January, 1993. By August, 1994, CNHE had sponsored seven training courses

in which 182 persons received training. The original goal for training under the program was 175 persons. The original proposal was to provide training for secretaries and other support personnel in rural areas. This training was to have been related to use of office equipment, office duties and procedures, and project related activities. This idea was abandoned, however, because many of the rural areas did not have adequate office equipment and because of the great logistical problems implied in identifying, mobilizing, and giving courses to this dispersed population. Agricultural firms also expressed a more immediate need for management, marketing and quality control training. In its place, CNHE established a program which focused on support of the agricultural sector, particularly as it related to non-traditional exports and environmental issues. The content of these courses was defined through a survey of needs in this sector. The courses offered are found in the following table.

Table 3: Courses Offered by CNHE Using STP Counterpart Funds

- 
- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| (1) | Meat Production and Processing                 |
| (2) | Integrated Pest Management                     |
| (3) | Pigeon Fea, Banana and Avocado Export          |
| (4) | Agribusiness Management for Export Industries  |
| (5) | Consumer Ecological and Environmental Demands  |
| (6) | Total Quality Management for Export Industries |
| (7) | Total Quality Management                       |
- 

Entities were selected to provide the training through open competition. Proposals were solicited and then evaluated by a technical committee on the basis of their technical and cost parameters. The courses were all favorably evaluated by the participants in them. They were primarily directed to private sector firms.

The cost of these seven courses was RD\$782,638.40. CNHE formally proposed several alternative uses for the remaining funds to STP, including the presentation of more courses, purchase of office equipment and an evaluation study. However, the STP declined to provide more funding for this activity. In that the training benchmarks were reached, STP turned the loan into a grant.

#### **B. Fundacion para el Credito Educativo (FUNDAPEC)**

FUNDAPEC was selected to provide training to public sector and NGO employees under this program. It was FUNDAPEC's understanding that these funds were to be used for training, and for surveys,

evaluation and follow-up activities, as proposed by FUNDAPEC in its original proposal, which was submitted to STP in 1990.

The training provided by FUNDAPEC under this program is found in the following table. The 15 courses offered provided training on topics of predominant concern to the Dominican government and the NGO community, and were consistent with USAID Mission Strategic Objectives. They included (1) Health, (2) Finances, (3) Education, and (4) Agriculture and Natural Resources. In all, FUNDAPEC provided training to 561 individuals. Two hundred AIDS trainers received training; 58 individuals received training in project formulation and development planning; 206 teachers received training on various education topics, and 97 individuals received training on environmental and natural resource management topics.

Table 4: Courses Offered by FUNDAPEC Using STP Counterpart Funds

- 
- |      |   |
|------|---|
| (1)  | Training Trainers against AIDS                |
| (2)  | Training Trainers against AIDS                |
| (3)  | Training Trainers against AIDS                |
| (4)  | Training Trainers against AIDS                |
| (5)  | Project Formulation                           |
| (6)  | Development Planning                          |
| (7)  | Distance Education Workshop                   |
| (8)  | Education Textbook Elaboration                |
| (9)  | Daily Curriculum Programming at Primary Level |
| (10) | First and Second Grade Learning Evaluation    |
| (11) | Work/Play Methodology                         |
| (12) | School Administration and Supervision         |
| (13) | Soil Conservation                             |
| (14) | Natural Resource Management                   |
| (15) | Environmental Education                       |
- 

FUNDAPEC used committees which it had established to select in-country training institutions and participants for DETRA to undertake the STP component of its program. As shown in the following table, DR\$1,101,563.70 were used to finance the training component. FUNDAPEC also used DR\$736,575.06 to establish an evaluation system for its training programs. In November, 1991, it contracted with Servicios Científicos y Técnicos Ingenieros Consultores, C. por A. (SERCITEC) to elaborate a Program of Evaluation and Follow-up for DETRA Sponsored Trainees. FUNDAPEC also contracted two individuals to help implement this program and to oversee all evaluation and follow-up activities. The subsequent evaluation study indicated that the program met its objectives.

Through this program FUNDAPEC broadened DETRA to include sectors not originally envisioned under the original DETRA design.

Table 5: Allocation of STP Counterpart Funds by FUNDAPEC

---

Total Training	DR\$1,101,563.70
Evaluation System	736,575.06
Adjustments	7,361.92
<hr/>	
Total.....	DR\$1,845,500.68

---

The majority of training provided by FUNDAPEC was in areas of Health, Education and Strengthening Democracy. Although not directly related to strengthening the private sector, increasing production efficiency, and increasing non-traditional exports, these areas were consistent with USAID Mission Strategic Objectives that were defined after DETRA was initiated.

FUNDAPEC acquired main frame computing equipment under this program, using RD\$252,848.00 of the funds allocated for the evaluation system. This expenditure was not authorized because it was not included in the approved 1993 budget. Subsequently, under Amendment #4 to the Agreement between STP and FUNDAPEC, dated August 4, 1994, FUNDAPEC agreed to compensate STP for this amount through "...Scholarships, Conditional Scholarships, Loan Scholarships, or any other similar modalities, in order to cover the cost of short courses, specialized training, or university training, at the technical or professional level, of a duration of no more than two years, in universities and technical education institutions in the country." A specified time frame and reporting procedure were also specified in this Amendment. It is unknown whether this condition has been met by FUNDAPEC.

#### **D. IMPACT ANALYSIS**

##### **1. Surveys**

This section contains an analysis of the impact of training provided under DETRA I. It is based on data from surveys of ex-participants and their employers, expert informant interviews, and file documentation from the USAID, FUNDAPEC and CNHE offices.

##### **A. Summary of Results from Four Follow-up Surveys**

Five surveys of ex-program participants were conducted during the latter stages of the project. They were used in previous evaluations and in reports prepared by CNHE and FUNDAPEC. These surveys were reported in studies by Renforth (1990), Hansen (1993), ISA (1993), Luciano Lopez (1994), and FUNDAPEC (1994). Although

the surveys varied somewhat in content and quality, they were all based in part on questions which were designed to assess impact of training on the ex-participants themselves, and on their employer institutions.

The Renforth study (1990) has been omitted in the following summary tables, because it was conducted over four years ago, and, therefore, was less likely to have captured as much impact. These tables summarize data from the other surveys using questions about impact related to occupational mobility, salary benefits, and job performance as assessed by the ex-participants and their employers.

These data provide a general overview of impact. They do not permit detailed aggregate analyses because questions were phrased in different ways in each survey. However, similarities in the findings makes them useful. Given the heterogeneity of the samples used in the studies, the data can be considered to be robust, and can be used to extrapolate findings to the entire population of ex-participants.

An important limitation of these studies is that they fail to assess the impact of much of the training administered by FUNDAPEC and CNHE using funds from the STP (Chiriboga, 1994; Gonzalez, 1995). As discussed earlier, each institution was provided with up to DR\$2,000,000 under this agreement. These funds were used to support short-term, in-country training which occurred during or after the surveys. However, much of this training, particularly that financed by FUNDAPEC, was in general education and in health and sex education. It probably had limited impact on salaries and job mobility. The impact of this type of training is more likely to be seen in changes in non-job related attitudes and behaviors. This training will be discussed in a separate section.

### Employment Status

Data in the following table indicate that 95 percent of the 366 ex-participants included in the surveys described above were employed at the time of the surveys. This figure is consistent for the private and public/NGO sectors. The FUNDAPEC survey reported 100 percent employment; however, it was only directed to employed former participants. The CNHE/LUCIANO survey reported that only 43 percent of the ex-participants worked for institutions which had initially sponsored them. This reflects the fact that many individuals, who received training some time before the survey, were interviewed. Many had changed jobs by the time the survey was conducted.

The fact that most of the ex-participants were employed indicates that the training which they received is probably having an impact on the Dominican Republic. Data which will be presented later from the Hansen survey indicate that job changes by ex-

Table 6: Employment Status of Ex-Participants

Survey	Employed		Unemployed		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
CNHE/LUCIANO	145	92	12	8	157	100
FUNDAPEC/FUND	50	100	---	---	50	100
FUNDAPEC/ISA	63	93	5	7	68	100
HANSEN	90	99	1	1	91	100
TOTAL.....	348	95	18	5	366	100

participants generally occur within the same economic sector, so that the impact is associated with the sectors in which training was received.

#### Occupational Mobility

Data in Table 7 indicate that over three fourths of the respondents reported that they had improved their employment situation as a result of the training which they received. This is a very significant finding because it reflects a quick return on investments made through training. As might be expected, the impact was slightly greater for those who completed graduate degree training. Graduate training increases marketability more than short-term, non-degree training. These ex-participants were the most likely to have changed employers. The data also suggest that the amount of job mobility among those who received graduate degree training did not vary much by institutional sponsor.

However, data also indicate that some variation existed by institutional sponsor for those who attended short-term training programs. The impact on job mobility of employees of public institutions and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) appears to have been somewhat greater. This may reflect high rates of job mobility in these sectors. Salaries are lower and there is a tendency initially to take jobs in these sectors to gain experience, with the expectation that they will eventually lead to employment in the private sector.

Table 7: Ex-Participant: Better Job Achieved Due to Training

Sample	Graduate Degree				Specialization				Total			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
CNHE/LUCIANO	56	82	12	18	53	69	24	31	109	75	36	25
FUNDAPEC	9	90	1	10	36	90	4	10	45	90	5	10
FUNDAPEC/ISA	7	80	2	20	46	85	8	15	53	84	10	16
HANSEN	11	78	3	22	52	68	24	32	63	70	27	30
TOTAL.....	83	82	18	18	187	76	60	24	270	78	78	22

Table 8: Ex-Participant: Job Currently Held Related To Training

Sample	Graduate Degree				Specialization				Total			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
CNHE/LUCIANO	62	91	6	9	62	83	15	17	124	86	21	14
FUNDAPEC	9	90	1	10	34	85	6	15	43	86	7	14
FUNDAPEC/ISA	7	78	2	22	48	89	6	11	55	87	8	13
HANSEN	11	79	3	21	52	68	24	32	63	70	27	30
TOTAL.....	89	88	12	12	196	79	51	21	285	82	63	18



### Applicability of Training

Information was gathered from both the ex-participants and their employers - if they were still employed by institutions which sponsored them - about the utility of the training. These data indicate that both the ex-participant and his/her employer judged that training had been of benefit to the employing institution.

Data in Table 8 summarize opinions of ex-participants regarding the relevance of the training for the jobs which they are performing. As was true for occupational mobility, data in Table 8 indicate that overall applicability is high. As regards total figures, 82 percent indicated that they found the training to be relevant to their jobs upon return. The percentages of respondents in the CNHE and FUNDAPEC samples, who reported positively, are almost identical -- 86 and 87 percent respectively.

The percentage of graduate degree recipients, who indicated that training received was relevant to their jobs, was greater than that for short-term training recipients. This may be because most graduate degree training is general in nature, and can be applied to a variety of situations. The relationship of graduate degree training to employment appears to be greater in the private sector, although the difference is not marked. Public sector institutions, because of the highly structured working conditions which they offer, are less likely to encourage or reward innovative behavior. Rather, they tend to encourage routinized behavior, consistent with structured sets of rules. This may explain why graduate training is utilized less by public sector employees.

Seventy-nine percent of the respondents, who attended short-term training programs, indicated that training received is related to the requirements of their current job. This percentage is

Table 9: Employer Assessment: Training Benefitted Organization

	Yes		No		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
<u>Survey</u>						
FUNDAPEC/ISA	54	86	9	14	63	100
HANSEN	76	84	14	16	90	100
<b>TOTAL.....</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>100</b>

\* Comparable data not presented in study completed by CNHE or FUNDAPEC/FUND.

Table 10: Ex-Participant: Experienced Better Job Performance Due to Training

Sample	Graduate Degree				Specialization				Total			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
CNHE/LUCIANO	54	80	14	20	21	73	5	27	75	80	19	20
FUNDAPEC	9	90	1	10	35	90	5	10	44	88	6	12
FUNDAPEC/ISA	6	67	3	33	39	72	15	28	45	71	18	29
HANSEN	11	79	3	21	37	49	39	51	48	53	42	47
TOTAL.....	80	80	21	20	132	67	64	33	212	71	85	29

slightly lower than for those who received graduate degree training. Little variation existed between the percentages of CNHE and FUNDAPEC respondents. They indicated that private sector and other sector employees applied training received with about equal frequency.

Employers tended to assess similarly the applicability of training to jobs held, as is shown in Table 9. Approximately 85 percent of the employers surveyed by ISA (1993) and Hansen (1993) indicated that what they learned had been applied to their jobs to the benefit of the sponsoring institution. At the executive level, application may have been reflected in greater management capacity, more effective decision-making, and more effective use of information to make informed decisions. At the technical level, it may have meant more effective application of technical skills acquired to their jobs.\*

### Job Performance

About two-thirds of the respondents of the surveys reported that their job performance improved due to their training experience. However, notable differences existed by level of training and by sector. Data in Table 10 indicate that recipients of graduate degree training were more likely to attribute improved job performance to their training. Eighty percent indicated this to be the case, as compared with only 53 percent of those who had received specialization training. This may reflect differences in the quality and scope of training. Graduate degree training took longer and may have enabled the ex-participants to develop a greater number of job related skills.

The contrast between these findings and those reported by recipients of short-term training is notable. Less than thirty percent of CNHE-sponsored ex-participants indicated that training helped to improve job performance. In contrast, over two thirds of the FUNDAPEC-sponsored ex-participants indicated that their training resulted in improved job performance. This difference may be explained in part by the way that the question was asked in the surveys; in the CNHE survey, it was much more precise. However, it may also be partly explained by the nature of the specialized training provided to the participants, as was discussed in the Hansen (1993) report.

---

\* For a more extensive discussion of the use of training to promote change in sponsoring institutions see Hansen (1993:52-54, 60-63).

### Investment Return

Employers were also asked whether they judged the investment made in training to have been worthwhile. Employers were required to continue paying salaries of participants while they were in training, and to employ them upon return. This was a major investment, particularly for institutions which sponsored participants for long-term training, that averaged slightly over two years. Data in Table 11 indicate that most of them believed the investment

Table 11: Employer Believes Training Worth the Investment

<u>Survey</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
CNHE/LUCIANO	135	93	10	7	145	100
FUNDAPEC/ISA	57	90	6	10	63	100
HANSEN	76	84	14	16	90	100
TOTAL.....	268	90	30	10	198	100

\* Comparable data not presented in study completed by FUNDAPEC.

to have been worthwhile. Indeed, 90 percent responded positively to this question. There was little variation between the CNHE and FUNDAPEC surveys. The Hansen (1993) survey results were slightly lower. This may result from the fact that his survey was actually conducted in 1992, and the returns on investment were still less apparent to the employers.

### Salary Increases

Perhaps one of the most significant indicators of training impact is salary increase. Human capital analysts tend to regard this as the best indicator of return on investment in education. These data are presented in Table 12. They indicate that over two thirds of the ex-participants surveyed reported receiving salary increases as a result of their training.

As was true for other impact indicators, percentages were much higher for those who received graduate degree training. Ninety-eight percent indicated that they had received a salary increase. Other data in the reports further indicate that the increases were

Table 12: Ex-Participant: Substantial Salary Increase Due to Training

Sample	Graduate Degree				Specialization				Total			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
CNHE/LUCIANO	68	100	--	--	61	79	16	21	129	89	16	11
FUNDAPEC	10	100	--	--	12	30	28	70	22	79	28	21
FUNDAPEC/ISA	7	78	2	22	48	89	6	11	55	87	8	13
HANSEN	13	93	1	7	22	29	54	71	35	39	55	61
TOTAL.....	98	97	3	3	143	57	104	43	241	69	107	31

substantial. The same data also suggest that this tendency was greater in the private sector. All of the CNHE-sponsored ex-participants indicated that they had received substantial salary increases. They may reflect a greater tendency in the private sector to reward individuals for human capital investments.

Those who undertook short-term training were less likely to have received significant salary increases. In part, this may be due to differences in the way the question was posed in different surveys. However, it may also reflect that much of the short-term training may not have been oriented to improving job performance per se. This was definitely the case for training related to democratic initiatives and health practices.

### Summary

Aggregate data from prior surveys indicate that returns from investments in training financed under DETRA were substantial. They tended to be slightly greater for ex-participants from the private sector, and for those who received graduate degree training. Ex-participants indicated that they benefitted by attainment of higher status and by way of salary increases. Both employers and ex-participants indicated that the employer institutions benefitted from the training through improved job performance.

### **B. Detailed Analyses from Hansen (1993) Survey**

Detailed analyses of survey results from the Hansen (1993) study are presented in this section. This study contains data which are important to issues found in the Scope of Work prepared for this impact assessment (See Appendix to Report). The section is divided into separate analyses of impact assessment by (1) sector of employment (private/public-NGO); (2) type of training (general/technical); (3) place of training (off-shore/in-country); and (4) nature of training (management/technical production). Dependent impact assessment variables are (1) application of training in the work place; (2) use of training to make changes; and (3) salary increase). None of the surveys presented data on the relationship between gender and these dependent variables. However, gender data are available for the distribution of training by economic sector of employment and other contextual factors.

### Sector of Employment

Data on the differential application of knowledge by sector of employment are found in Table 13. They indicate that roughly 50 percent of all ex-participants believed that they were applying over half of what they learned in their jobs. This is a generic finding, but does suggest that skills acquired through training are being used. Skills acquired through off-shore training are more

public and NGO sectors. Fifty-seven percent reported that they received salary increases because of the training, whereas only 45 percent of the ex-participants from the private sector indicated likely to be applied than those acquired through in-country short-term training. Ex-participants from the public and NGO sectors were about 50 percent more likely to have reported this high level of application of knowledge gained. This may reflect the nature of the training acquired by individuals in this sample. Public sector employees were more likely to have received off-shore training. Only 24 percent of the ex-participants were applying less than 50%

Table 13: Application of Knowledge Acquired by Employment Sector

Application of Knowledge Acquired								
Employment Sector	Less than 50%		50%		More than 50%		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Private	14	25	18	32	24	43	56	100
Public/NGO	7	22	5	16	20	62	32	100
Total	21	24	23	26	44	50	88	100

of what they learned. Apparently, application of training is slightly greater in the public sector and in the NGO community than in the private sector.

The relationship between sector of employment and impact of training on salaries is presented in Table 14. About half of the respondents indicated that the training lead to a salary increase. However, training had a greater impact on ex-participants from the this to be true. In part this may explained by the large number of respondents from the private sector who participated in short-term, in-country training programs. These programs generally had lower economic pay-off for the respondents.

Where respondents were employed prior to training appears to be less important than where they were employed after training. Five FUNDAPEC-sponsored ex-participants were employed in the private sector at the time of the survey. They indicated that they

Table 14: Impact of Training on Salary by Sector of Employment

Employment Sector	Training Lead to Salary Increase					
	Yes		No		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Private	24	45	29	55	53	100
Public/NGO	16	57	12	43	28	100
Total	40	49	41	51	81	100

received substantial salary increases subsequent to the training. These salary increases may have been more of a consequence of changing employers than the training itself.

Overall, it appears that there is a slight tendency for training to result in higher salaries. Although not reflected in data presented in the table, this tendency is greater for off-shore training, particularly for ex-participants from the private sector.

Data on the relationship between employment sector and use of knowledge to make changes in employer institutions are presented in Table 15. Most ex-participants had used the training to promote

Table 15: Knowledge Used to Make Changes by Sector of Employment

Employment Sector	Knowledge Acquired Used to Make Changes					
	Yes		No		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Private	31	54	26	46	57	100
Public/NGO	20	67	10	33	30	100
Total	51	59	36	41	87	100



changes in their employer institutions. However, the percentage responding affirmatively was greater for the public sector and for NGOs than it was for the private sector. Sixty-seven percent of those sponsored by FUNDAPEC responded affirmatively as compared to only 54 percent of those sponsored by CNHE. As was true for salary increases, the difference may also be due to the greater percentage of public sector and NGO ex-participants who received off-shore training. Other data indicated that ex-participants in in-country training programs were more likely to find the training received to be less relevant to their job responsibilities.

In sum, these data suggest that training has resulted in participant initiated changes in their employer institutions more often than it has not. However, this overall trend is primarily due to training of public and NGO employees.

The data presented on impact of training by sector of employment indicate that there are important differences between sectors. Public sector and NGO participants are more likely to use their training to introduce changes upon return and they are more likely to experience personal benefit from the training. Several factors may, in part, explain this differential impact. These are (1) the tendency for more public sector and NGO participants in the sample to have participated in off-shore training activities, which have higher returns; (2) the higher quality of public sector and NGO training plans; (3) the fact that public sector participants were more likely to have participated in longer-term training; and (4) the higher job mobility of public sector and NGO participants.

### Type of Training

Type of training refers to the general versus technical content of training. General training is that which provides information which is useful across a gamut of industries and circumstances. It is probably best represented by management and administrative training and site visitations and tours. Technical training is targeted on qualities, attributes or needs of specific products or industries. Examples are short courses on shoe production and tailoring of articles of clothing.

Data in Table 16 summarize the relationship between type of training and application of knowledge acquired through training. Approximately half of the respondents have applied over 50 percent of the knowledge they acquired through the program. However, those who participated in general training programs were more likely to have applied their training. Only 10 percent of the respondents who participated in general training programs reported that they were using less than 50 percent of what they learned, while 55 percent indicated that they used over 50 percent of their training. This distribution contrasts sharply with the distribution for technical training. Thirty percent of those receiving technical

training indicated that they used less than 50 percent of the knowledge they acquired. And only 47 percent indicated that they used more than 50 percent.

General training appears to be more easily applied than technical training. In part, this may reflect the nature of the training. Technical training either fits the job or it does not. Management, administrative and other types of general knowledge are more easily applied to different occupations and work-related problems. Future technical training programs should take greater

Table 16: Application of Knowledge Acquired by Type of Training

Type of Training	Application of Knowledge Acquired							
	Less than 50%		50%		More than 50%		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
General	2	10	7	35	11	55	20	100
Technical	20	30	15	23	31	47	66	100
Total	22	26	22	26	42	48	86	100

care to match the training needs of potential participants with the technical content of courses offered.

Table 17: Impact of Training on Salary by Type of Training

Type of Training	Training Lead to Salary Increase					
	Yes		No		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
General	21	55	17	45	38	100
Technical	16	57	12	43	28	100
Total	37	56	29	44	66	100

Data on the relationship between type of training and the impact of training on salaries of ex-participants are presented in Table 17. Fifty-six percent of the ex-participants indicated that their training led to salary increases. However, there was a marked difference in the relationship between type of training and salary increase by sector of employment which is not presented in the table. Hansen's study (1993) indicated that over 90 percent of the private sector ex-participants, who received general training, believed that the training favorably impacted on their salaries. Most occupy management and administrative positions. They were rewarded for increasing their administrative and management skills.

In sum, all ex-participants were likely to have been rewarded for having received general degree or non-degree training.

Data in Table 18 indicate that knowledge acquired was used to introduce changes in employer institutions more often than it was not. This is true for general and technical training. Three-fifths of the recipients of general training (12 of 20) indicated that they used their training to make changes as did 61 percent of the recipients of technical training (41 of 67).

Table 18: Knowledge Used to Make Changes by Type of Training

Type of Training	Knowledge Acquired Used to Make Changes					
	Yes		No		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
General	12	60	8	40	20	100
Technical	41	61	26	39	67	100
Total	53	61	34	39	87	100

Hansen (1993) reported that FUNDAPEC-sponsored ex-participants were most likely to have used the training for this purpose. Seventy-seven percent of them responded affirmatively, while only 53 percent of the CNHE-sponsored ex-participants responded affirmatively. Many ex-participants felt that they were not provided with opportunities, nor were they encouraged, to put new management ideas into practice.

Data presented above on type of training suggest that general training is more likely to result in greater impacts on employer institution performance than is technical training. At least two explanations for this finding resulted from conversations with ex-participants. First, general training provided ex-participants with a greater awareness of alternative markets and alternative product development. Technical training was more likely to focus on improving product quality. Both are important, but knowledge which leads to new market development and alternative export product identification may have had more impact. Second, general training is more applicable across a variety of circumstances. It is easier for participants to apply this knowledge upon return regardless of where they work or what they do. Some ex-participants indicated that the technical training which they received was not applicable to their jobs. Inappropriate candidate screening for this training may have reduced its utility for participants when they returned to their jobs.

### Place of Training

Place of training refers to whether the training was provided in the Dominican Republic or at an off-shore site. International training is more highly valued by participants. However, it is less accessible to many, because it generally is more time consuming and costly.

Data in Table 19 reflect the relationship between place of training and the application of knowledge acquired through training. Half of the ex-participants reported having applied over

Table 19: Application of Knowledge by Place of Training

Place of Training	Application of Knowledge Acquired							
	Less than 50%		50%		More than 50%		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Off-Shore	5	11	12	27	27	62	44	100
In-Country	18	41	9	20	17	39	44	100
Total	23	26	21	24	44	50	88	100

half of what they learned through their training programs. On balance, off-shore training was more likely to be applied. Sixty-two percent of the respondents who received this type of training, reported applying over 50 percent of what they learned. This contrasts with only 39 percent of those who received in-country training. Only 11 percent of those who received off-shore training indicated that they applied less than 50 percent of it, whereas 41 percent of those who received in-country training did so.

The relationship between location of training and impact of training on participant salaries is illustrated in Table 20. The data indicate that less than 50 percent of the respondents reported

Table 20: Impact of Training on Salary by Place of Training

Place of Training	Training Lead to Salary Increase					
	Yes		No		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Off-Shore	25	54	21	46	46	100
In-Country	14	31	31	69	45	100
Total	38	42	52	58	91	100

that training resulted in salary increases for them. However, there is a considerable difference by location of training. Over half of those who received off-shore training indicated that they received a salary increase because of the training, whereas less than a third of those who received in-country training did. Hansen (1993) reported that both public and private sector participants who received off-shore training were more likely to indicate that training had a significant positive impact on their salaries.

Similar trends were apparent in the use of knowledge acquired through training to make changes in employer institutions. Data in Table 21 show that less than half of the participants used knowledge acquired to make changes. However, there was considerable variation by place of training. Off-shore training was more likely to have been used to introduce changes. Over half of those in the sample, who received off-shore training, reported that they had used what they learned to introduce changes. This contrasts sharply with in-country training. Less than a third reported that they had used what they learned to make changes.

Hansen (1993) again reported that these trends were consistent for both private sector and public sector and NGO ex-participants. Public sector ex-participants were more likely to have applied knowledge obtained through off-shore training. Eighty-two percent of the public sector participants indicated that they have used it in this way. By contrast, only 60 percent of the private sector participants, who received off-shore training, did so.

Table 21: Knowledge Used to Make Changes by Place of Training

Place of Training	Knowledge Acquired Used to Make Changes					
	Yes		No		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Off-Shore	25	54	21	46	46	100
In-Country	14	31	31	69	45	100
Total	39	43	52	57	91	100

Data on place of training suggest that off-shore training has a consistently greater positive impact on employer institutions, participant careers and project target objectives. Off-shore training was more frequently applied, more frequently used to make changes in employer firms, and was more likely to have favorably impacted on salaries.

#### Nature of Training

Nature of training is somewhat analogous to type of training. It refers to whether or not the training is in management and administrative theory and practice or related to technical and/or production topics.

Data in Table 22 indicate that management and administrative training is more often applied than is technical training. About two thirds of the ex-participants, who received this training, indicated that they applied more than 50 percent of it in their work. This contrasts sharply with technical training. Only about a fourth of those who received this training reported having applied more than 50 percent of what they learned.

This trend is consistent with the distribution of those who indicated that they applied less than 50 percent of what they learned. Over half of those who received technical training reported low application of what they learned. This contrasts sharply with the figure for those who received management training. Only 16 percent reported applying less than 50 percent of what they had learned.

Table 22: Application of Knowledge Acquired by Nature of Training

Nature of Training	Application of Knowledge Acquired							
	Less than 50%		50%		More than 50%		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Management	10	16	17	27	36	57	63	100
Technical	12	52	5	22	6	26	23	100
Total	22	26	22	26	42	48	86	100

Hansen (1993) noted in his study that technical training related to production issues is much less frequently applied. Over 70 percent of the participants from both sectors indicated that they applied 50 percent or less of the technical training which they received. Of even greater significance was that 63 percent of the private sector respondents had used less than half of the technical training they received. This is important for future mission programming of training in that there is a tendency toward more short-term technical training. Many respondents indicated that technical course content had no bearing on their jobs, and, therefore, was essentially useless to them.

This outcome may reflect a problem in the recruitment process for technical short-courses. Insufficient care may be given to identifying candidates who can readily apply the technical training. The more technical the training, the narrower the base of qualified candidates for the training. Administrative and management training, on the other hand, is more applicable to different situations and different types of industries.

While data on level of application indicate that management-type training is applied more often, data in Table 23 indicate that

trainees use both management and technical training to make changes in their sponsoring institutions. Management training is most used to make changes. Sixty-one percent of the ex-participants, who received this type of training, responded affirmatively. However, over half of those who received technical training also responded affirmatively.

Although not all training has been applied by participants to their jobs, these data indicate that training has had a positive,

Table 23: Knowledge Used to Make Changes by Nature of Training

Nature of Training	Knowledge Acquired Used to Make Changes					
	Yes		No		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Management	28	61	18	57	46	100
Technical	20	53	18	47	38	100
Total	48	57	36	43	84	100

important impact on the organization and production facets of sponsoring institutions. The overall impact of training can probably be increased by tightening up the selection process for participants. This will be more difficult if training plans are not required for short courses. Descriptions of contents of courses should be distributed to prospective participants and to their sponsors prior to the nomination process.

Data in Table 24 reflect returns which participants received from their training. Salary increases are related to nature of training in the same way that they relate to type of training. The greatest returns are evidently from management training. Forty-three percent of those, who received this training, reported having received important salary increases as a consequence of it. Technical training tended to be less rewarded through salary increases. Only 26 percent of the ex-participants who received it, also indicated that they had received a substantial salary increase.

Hansen (1993) reported differences in salary rewards for training for ex-participants from the private sector and from the public sector and NGO community. In part these differences



probably reflect the scope of impact of different types of training on employer operations. Changes in management and administrative patterns are more likely to impact on the entire organization whereas technical impacts are more likely to be product specific. This observation is in no way meant to demean the importance of product quality improvement for firm competitiveness. This may simply be less likely to be reflected in wage increases.

Whereas the impact of training on salaries has been highlighted, it is important to bear in mind that less than 50 percent

Table 24: Impact of Training on Salary by Nature of Training

Nature of Training	Training Led to Salary Increase					
	Yes		No		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Management	29	43	38	57	67	100
Technical	6	26	17	74	23	100
Total	35	39	55	61	90	100

of the respondents indicated that their training had any impact on their salaries. Thus, incentives other than salary increases may be necessary to induce participation in the training programs. The opportunity to travel is an obvious incentive for off-shore training. Incentives for in-country training are less apparent.

Data on nature of training clearly indicate that, from the perspective of ex-participants, management training had a greater impact on employer institutions, on the careers of the participants, and on DETRA objectives. Management training was much more likely to be applied and in fact used to make changes in employer institutions. It was also more likely to have led to a salary increase than technical training.

### Conclusion

Although the data from various surveys were not standardized, they all suggest that significant returns from training have been obtained by the individual participants and their sponsoring

institutions. They suggest that returns on investments in training are likely to increase over time, particularly for investments in long-term professional and management training.

## 2. Case Studies

In depth interviews were conducted with six former participants. Three of them were male and three were female; three were sponsored by CNHE and three were sponsored by FUNDAPEC. The interviews clearly indicate the strong impact which training had on their lives and careers. Particularly the long-term training helped them acquire professional self images and to discover additional ways to contribute to the development of their country.

### RAMON MEJIA

**Sponsoring Unit: CNHE**

**Training Program: M.S. International Business**

**Training Institution: University of South Carolina**

**Present Employer: R.H. Mejia & Co., C x A**

"I would consider the training opportunity provided to me through DETRA to have been superb. The education that was provided to me changed my vision of life itself. It was not so much the book learning; rather it was the overall program, and the principles which I learned, such as how to establish priorities; the value of teamwork; and time management. These principles are not only important for me in business, but also in all other facets of life."

Mr. Mejia is representative of a new generation of Dominican businessmen who are competing in international markets. He was sponsored by a family business, "Flores Primor." He received his training in international business at the University of South Carolina, whose program is ranked number one in the U.S. Upon returning to the Dominican Republic, he took a job for a year as a financial analyst for Dole Company. This allowed him to apply many of the principles of international marketing that he had learned in his graduate program. After a year with this company, he resigned to return to the family business. This business was then focused on non-traditional agricultural exports to the U.S. and it was being managed by an expatriate. Mr. Mejia took over the business, and changed the focus from export of products to sale in the domestic market, including hotels that cater to international tourists. This proved to be quite profitable, and he was able to move the business forward. Recently, he has turned the business over to his brother, and he has started his own import/export business. This business is also making a profit.

Mr. Mejia reported that the training definitely made him more employable. He indicated that it had changed his way of thinking. It taught him how "to do business," "how to read business scenarios," "how to learn about opportunities," and "how to take calculated business risks."

When asked what the most important component of his training program was, Mr. Mejia replied that it was the six month internship with the Sara Lee Corporation, a conglomerate which includes textile products assembled at "maquiladoras" in Central America. During this internship he worked for a division that dealt with Latin American plants, focusing primarily on inventory control systems. He indicated that the formal materials used in the classes were important. However, the opportunity to work with and to exchange ideas with Chief Executive Officers of major corporations was by far the most useful learning experience.

Mr. Mejia recommended that USAID and other donors consider similar training programs for the Dominican Republic. They should focus on training middle and lower class students. He believes that the experiences provided -- particularly in business -- have the greatest pay off for the Dominican Republic, and will in the long run bring about rapid economic development.

#### SERGIO GRULLON

**Sponsoring Unit: CNHE**

**Training Program: Off-Shore "Nursery Plant Production"**

**Training Institution: Agritech Consulting Firm (Miami)**

**Present Employer: Agricentro, C. x A.**

"The course was relatively short, lasting for only one week. However, it provided me with a broader vision of the total plant industry. The course provided an overview of all aspects of the industry, including production, management, packaging, marketing and financing. I came away with a better understanding of the industry. The interaction with other course members from other countries of Latin America was also important. We were able to discuss mutual problems and how we addressed them in each of our countries."

Mr. Sergio Grullon has been involved in agriculture for many years, having based his career on a graduate program at the University of Florida. He is currently Vice President and Treasurer for the Agricentro Co. At the same time, he is involved in several other agribusiness firms, such as Arboles Dominicanos. C. x A. and Flores Primor. Mr. Grullon indicated that it did not make much sense to expect that participation in a 5 day short course would lead to a promotion or salary increase. In his case they did not. However, he touched on the importance of continuing

education throughout one's career, and the positive impact which this has. In his case, this course was an important part of his life long learning process.

The course was designed for executive managers. In addition to the management side, the course provided him with important information and techniques related to market development, principles about how to organize production systems to address specific markets, and packaging techniques related to sales promotion. He indicated that the knowledge gained has been used by him to initiate changes in his company. These changes relate to decision-making modes and procedures, particularly as they relate to production, and product packaging and transport. He also indicated that the course will continue to impact favorably on his career.

Mr. Grullon indicated that the course could be improved by increasing the number of participants. This would allow for greater interaction, and discussion of practical problems experienced in non-U.S. settings and solutions to them. For individuals such as himself, who have been immersed in the industry for many years, he also recommended that the course have a strong practical component.

#### GRACE RIVERA

**Sponsoring Unit: CNHE**

**Training Program: M.S. Computer Information Systems**

**Training Institution: University of Maryland**

**Present Employer: Dole Dominicana**

"I am a systems analyst. For me it is essential to have the opportunity to grow. I grew greatly thanks to my training in the U.S. It allowed me to compare Dominican reality with reality in the U.S. The M.S. program enabled me to learn how systems are approached in the U.S. and to learn the latest techniques of systems analysis. In a broader sense, the experience enabled me to grow personally. It was my first attempt to live alone and to take control of my life. I learned much about systems analysis, tools used to do these analyses, and their application in the U.S. Since returning, I have been able to apply many of them to my work setting here in the Dominican Republic.

Before beginning her studies in the U.S., Ms. Rivera was a systems analyst for "Flor Dom," a branch of Manicera, C. x A. She returned initially to work for the same company. However, work conditions changed and she took a systems job with the Banco Popular, eventually leaving this company for her present job with Dole Dominicano. She is presently a systems project leader. In this position, she is involved in a re-engineering program for

Dole. This program is taking a hard look at all administrative and managerial processes in the company.

She reported that she has received several salary increases, which were in large measure a consequence of having completed her M.S. degree. Her promotion to systems project leader, responsible for a major component of the re-engineering exercise by Dole, is also a consequence of her additional training.

Ms. Rivera indicated that her training has made her more employable. She indicated that she was offered several jobs with multinational corporations [Exxon and Mars] upon completion of her graduate program. She declined them to return to the Dominican Republic. She was also offered a job at the University of Maryland in its Department of Computer Sciences, but rejected it.

She indicated that her work with the re-engineering project focuses on production effectiveness and efficiency improvement. She does not currently contemplate moving jobs, but indicated that were she to do so, she would attempt to remain in the same economic sector. Thus her training is currently being used to strengthen the economic sectors targeted by DETRA.

#### **EVAYDEE PEREZ S.**

**Sponsoring Unit: FUNDAPEC**

**Training Program: Off-Shore: "Ecological Principles and Sustainable Development"**

**Training Institution: Costa Rica (Organization of Tropical Studies/ University of Costa Rica)**

**Present Employer: Fundacion PRONATURA**

"That short-term training experience represented my first opportunity to travel overseas. I had many expectations about the course, most of which were met. It had a marked impact on my professional life. I was at a cross roads and it help me confirm my decision to continue working on environmental issues, rather than moving into other areas more closely aligned with my business management training. I learned that there were many more things to learn about environmental management and how to apply them."

Ms. Perez has worked for the Fundacion PRONATURA for two and one half years. She obtained a part-time position in the public sector working on environmental issues while completing her undergraduate degree program in business management at the Catholic University "Madre y Maestra." Later she was provided with an opportunity to work with PRONATURA which offered better working conditions and salary.

Ms. Perez indicated that the training had a positive impact on her professional life and on PRONATURA. She indicated that she has received several salary increases due to the training. The first was related to a promotion to Public Relations Officer shortly after completing the training program. Recently, she has assumed the project coordinator position for a four year McArthur Foundation sponsored program in biosphere reserves.

She attributes these promotions to training received under DETRA. She indicated that she really did not know how to do her job prior to the training. The course taught her how to do many aspects of her job. More importantly, the course also taught her about environmental policy and principles of sustainable development. These courses complemented the courses in business administration which were part of her undergraduate program.

More importantly, Ms. Perez indicated that she learned lessons for life through the program. She indicated that she learned of the need to include natural resources in the accounting of national resources; the cost of cutting trees and other natural resource depletion acts. She indicated that international relations have been made easier for her, particularly how to prepare written materials for potential international partners, acceptable accounting methods, etc.

Ms. Perez indicated that she has used these experiences to make changes in PRONATURA. These changes have been more procedural and related to her own work, including preparation of publications and other technical reports. She indicated that the training will continue to impact favorably on her career.

Ms. Perez had very little negative to say about the program. She indicated that the orientation received from USAID/Dominican Republic was excellent. If there was one problem, it was the detailed medical examinations required. She indicated that parts of the course were disorganized, and that some of the course logistics were inadequate. The course lasted 21 days.

She indicated that the most positive aspect of the course was the interaction with other participants, many of whom held important planning and policy positions in their countries, and with the professors. She indicated that this interaction helped her to understand what needs to be taken into account when making program decisions, such as to enlist the active participation of communities residing in affected areas in order to make programs work.

## LUIS B. REYES

Sponsoring Unit: FUNDAPEC

Training Program: M.S. Economics

Training Institution: Vanderbilt University

Present Employer: Central Bank

"The opportunity to complete an M.S. degree in Economics in the U.S. had an important impact on my life. It allowed me to obtain professional tools that have helped me to compete successfully in my professional field in the Dominican Republic. In addition to this professional growth, the M.S. program reinforced several extremely important personality characteristics, such as discipline, perseverance and dedication to the task at hand. These have been essential in allowing me to achieve my professional and personal goals in life."

Mr. Reyes has worked for the Central Bank of the Dominican Republic for the past twelve years. He was selected by Bank officials to continue his studies under DETRA at Vanderbilt University, where he completed an M.S. degree in Economics. He continues his employment at the Central Bank where he is currently the Deputy Director of the Department of Monetary Programming and Economic Research.

Mr. Reyes indicated that his salary and position actually decreased momentarily after returning for his training experience. This was because the Bank was undergoing a re-engineering program, and the old structure was in flux. However, his current job status is higher than that he held prior to his initiation of the study program. His salary has also been correspondingly increased.

Mr. Reyes indicated that the training has increased his employability. Indeed, there are many opportunities for employment in the private sector with institutions that reward solely on the basis of having completed an M.S. degree in the United States. He indicated that organizations, such as CODETEL and private banks pay better salaries and seek economists with training in the U.S. However, he has committed himself to a government career, and has not sought these opportunities.

Upon return he has dedicated himself to improving the technical capacity of the Bank. He believes that this suffered some deterioration during recent years, as many of the more competent technical staff took jobs in the private sector. He has sought to increase the level of technical qualifications of the staff and to obtain more funding for technical operations, especially research. He indicated that his professional training has been applied in several related ways, such as (1) advocating and orienting policy reforms; (2) leading technical reforms in the Bank; and (3) improving the climate for and conduct of economic

research in areas such as the Department of National Accounts. On a more general level, he has worked on improving the professional climate in the Bank, particularly that related to work discipline. He has sought to lead as a role model, and to hire others as role models for office staff. He believes that the professional training he received at Vanderbilt will help him throughout his career. While there, he acquired basic tools of economic research, in addition to learning how to learn, and reinforcing work principles, such as persistence, dedication and discipline.

Mr. Reyes indicated that programs like DETRA could be improved by using individuals in managerial positions who are familiar with graduate programs in the U.S. He indicated that he experienced problems with his English training and adaptation to life in the U.S. that could have been avoided. For example, he had difficulty in obtaining a Social Security Number, without which he was unable to rent an apartment. He indicated that CNHE fellows had an easier time of it, because of the support provided them by Development Associates, once they arrived to the U.S.

In general, Mr. Reyes was very positive about his program. He hopes that an additional program will be initiated that will give colleagues in the Bank an opportunity to study in the U.S., and indicated that he would be happy to participate in such a program by serving on an advisory committee of ex-fellows.

#### **CRISTINA THOMEN**

**Sponsoring Unit: FUNDAPEC**

**Training Program: Off-Shore "U.S. Money and Capital Markets"**

**Training Institution: New York Institute of Finance**

**Present Employer: Bolsa de Valores Dominicana**

**"The finance world is a key dimension of the global economy. It is integral to the ability to compete in international markets. With increasing global competition, this is becoming more true every day. The training which I received through DETRA has permitted me to contribute to the economic development of my country by teaching about capital markets. I help others to learn through the courses which I teach. I have been able to greatly improve them, thanks to the training I received, and the contact which I made while undertaking the training."**

Ms. Thomen has indicated that she is currently in her third career, namely development of capital markets. She is the Administrative Chargee of the Dominican Stock Market. In addition, she is also the Executive Director of a non-profit organization entitled the Instituto Dominicano de Mercados Capitaes (IDMEC) In these capacities, she has dedicated herself to the development of capital markets for the benefit of Dominican economic development.



Ms. Thomen indicated that she failed to receive a salary increase as a consequence of participating in the program. She indicated that this would have been inappropriate given the objectives of IDMEC, and the fact that it is a non-profit organization. She indicated that has received a promotion in job title with the Dominican Stock Market.

Women have a rough time competing in certain domains of the Dominican economy that are still defined as male dominant. Capital markets is one of these domains. However, Ms. Thomen asserted that the training would help her to seek alternative employment, if indeed this were her interest. She indicated that she has been able to employ most of what she learned in the short course. Each member of the course was given 18 books about stock markets. She has used them to improve her performance as a part-time professor at UNAPEC, and as a professor in the courses offered by IDMEC. She and her colleagues have revamped the content of their courses based on this experience.

She indicated that the training will have a long lasting effect on her, because of its marked impact on her professional life. Part of that impact was through the materials which she studied; part of it was through the contacts which she made. The course enabled her to interact intensively with mid-career students from around the world, all of whom occupied important positions. It also enabled her to make contacts with U.S. faculty members who have since been used in courses offered in the Dominican Republic. She indicated, however, that a very valuable aspect of the program was the course content, much of which has been incorporated into curriculum of courses which she offers in the Dominican Republic.

## **E. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION**

### **1. U.S. Agency for International Development [USAID]**

The General Development Office of the USAID Mission in Santo Domingo was responsible for overseeing implementation of the project. The Office was responsible for obtaining visas for CNHE and FUNDAPEC participants to travel to the U.S. and other countries. The Office worked closely with PIET in placing the first CNHE-sponsored students, and all FUNDAPEC-sponsored students in training programs in the U.S. The GDO was responsible for the revision and certification of medical examinations, transcripts and application documentation review, transmission of departure notices, and follow up for all off-shore participants under this project. The GDO also briefed participants on their program in the U.S. and debriefed with many of them upon their return. Former participants were generally complimentary of the professional, efficient operation of the General Development Office. As regards

FUNDAPEC trainees specifically, the GDO also handled the processing, documentation, placement, monitoring and follow up of participants attending third country training, with the assistance of other USAID Missions, particularly those of Mexico and Costa Rica.

The Office was also responsible for overseeing the program performance of CNHE, the CNHE contractor [DAI], and FUNDAPEC. This was performed by the GDO Chief from August, 1986 to November, 1988 when Mr. William Binford was hired under a Personal Services Contract to manage contract activities. He worked closely with the Project Offices in CNHE and FUNDAPEC, interacting on a daily basis with staff in these offices. At times, he provided them with appropriate assistance in the performance of their duties, particularly those related to USAID implementation and reporting requirements. Both CNHE and FUNDAPEC were highly complimentary of his participation in the project.

## **2. National Council of Businessmen [CNHE]**

CNHE was initially contracted to manage all in-country aspects of DETRA. It was selected because of its close association with the business sector. It established an Office for the program and contracted personnel to staff it. Problems which it encountered in following USAID established recruitment procedures are discussed in previous program evaluations (Renforth, 1990; Hansen, 1993) and will not be discussed here. These problems were intertwined with the broader issues of equity and efficiency. Program requirements tended to favor participation by relatives of firm owners and managers, particularly those which were family owned and/or small. However, these individuals were not underprivileged.

CNHE experienced several changes in program managers during the course of the project. These transitions, however, did not negatively affect performance of responsibilities. CNHE continued to meet the original objectives of the program, while FUNDAPEC directed much of the training it managed to the new objectives. CNHE used committee structures to select overseas training candidates, to select in-country training institutions, and to select in-country trainees.

## **3. Foundation APEC [FUNDAPEC]**

FUNDAPEC was contracted in 1988 to provide in-country management for training of individuals from the public sector and from NGOs. It established an Office and contracted two persons to manage the program. Their responsibilities were similar to those of the CNHE management staff. They helped to select candidates for overseas training, to select institutions to provide in-country training, and to select participants for in-country training. Staff worked well with the USAID General Development Office.

Management of financial aspects of the program were divided between the FUNDAPEC Project Manager and the FUNDAPEC Accounting Office. FUNDAPEC experienced some accounting problems with USAID. Unlike CNHE, FUNDAPEC had other major programs similar to DETRA. During the early phase of the project, it tended to mingle funds from various sources. USAID found this to be an unacceptable practice; however, it made it possible for DETRA to continue program operations during periods in which USAID decided to withhold funding approvals from FUNDAPEC.

FUNDAPEC focused on several content areas that did not fit well in the original project framework. These included public health, primary education and democracy strengthening. However, these topics were consistent with newly defined USAID Mission strategic objectives.

Partners in International Education and Training (PIET) was responsible for placing off-shore trainees, for their logistical support and for follow-up activities. PIET received high marks from USAID, former participants and FUNDAPEC. All indicated that PIET's participation in DETRA was highly satisfactory.

#### **4. Development Associates, Inc.**

Development Associates, Inc. (DAI) was contracted by the USAID Mission to "... provide technical assistance for the organization, administration and training of staff to successfully implement the Project. The U.S. Contractor....directly responsible through a U.S. home office for placement, maintenance and follow-up of all participants." Its activities were bound by objectives of the project, namely:

- to increase and diversify the export of non-traditional products by the Dominican private sector;
- to increase the production and efficiency of Dominican private sector firms; and
- to establish and develop cultural and professional ties between Dominicans and U.S. citizens.

It worked closely with CNHE project staff in Santo Domingo in selecting and processing candidates.

In general, DAI performed well under the contract. It helped CNHE attain DETRA EOPS indicators. DAI provided the following figures in its final report (DAI, 1994). In all, over forty percent of the trainees placed in the U.S. by DAI were placed at HBCUS after October 1, 1991. Forty percent of the participants were female. The courses in which participants were placed conform to the original project objectives. Forty-eight percent received training in exports and marketing strategies; thirty-two percent

### End of Project Status Indicators

	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Obtained</u>
M.S. Degrees	36	34
Short-Term, Overseas	265	348
Short-Term, In-Country	1,350	2,044

received training in management skills; and about sixteen percent received training in banking and other financial matters.

The USAID Mission demonstrated its satisfaction with DAI contract performance by contracting with it for the second phase of the project in 1991.

DAI encountered several limiting factors in the conduct of its technical assistance. They are evident in DAI's self evaluations of program performance and in those provided by other participants in the project. Perhaps the two most significant problems identified by program participants were sometimes inadequate placement of participants and poor quality technical assistance provided to the CNHE Project Office.

#### A. Placement

Some participants registered complaints about their placements. In general the complaints resulted from unhappiness with the quality of programs in which they were placed. There are at least two explanations why placement problems occurred. DAI indicated that its ability to place participants was limited by objective qualifications of the candidates. Particularly during early stages of the program, many of the candidates had low GRE and GMAT scores, and low Grade Point Averages. DAI reported that this disqualified them from placement in many first tier universities. Placement in some of these universities was also limited by the amount of funding available for the project. Many of these universities insisted in charging full out-of-state tuition. Similarly, short-term training was negotiated on a program-by-program basis. When DAI was unable to negotiate contracts with preferred institutions within general cost parameters, it often selected other programs for the training.

Participants were asked to rate the placement process by DAI. The following distribution of responses was reported by them in their Final Report (DAI, 1994).

# Participant Evaluation of Program Placement by DAI

	<u>Percent</u>
Excellent/Very Good	50
Good/Satisfactory	50
Unsatisfactory	--

## B. In-Country Technical Assistance

Students and some participants in the program reported that local technical assistance sometimes did a poor job of handling required paperwork. This was reflected, for example, in delays in getting documents, such as PIO/P's to the USAID Mission. On other occasions, documents were delivered, but were incorrectly filled out.

Although located in the CNHE Office, the local technical assistant worked for DAI rather than CNHE. She was responsible for helping to select, orient and place candidates. At times, her assessments of candidate selection and local orientation varied from those of CNHE staff and differences were not resolved easily.

Most aspects of the U.S. based training went well. However, at times DAI had to deal with uncontrollable variables. Several were discussed in its final reports (1991, 1994), including:

- **HBCU Placement:** Some key HBCUs were uninterested in bidding on short courses.
- **Participant Violation of Rules:** Some participants actually disappeared in the U.S. or left courses without notifying DAI or receiving permission to do so.
- **Health Insurance:** HAC insurance was slow in issuing identification cards which created problems for participants in registering for classes and otherwise dealing with university procedures
- **Interruptions in Funding:** Failure by the Dominican government to meet conditions related to AID Development Programs, such as those of the Brooke-Alexander Amendment, caused discontinuities in funding and program activity.
- **Candidate Attrition:** Some candidates were deselected from the program after having been placed. Sometimes this occurred shortly before programs were to begin. In some cases DAI had to meet financial commitments encumbered for the proposed training, despite the cancellations.

Students were generally very positive in their assessment of U.S. based training experiences. Consistent with the above discussion, their criticisms of the program tended to reflect problems in placement and in handling of applications. They are reflected in several quotations of student evaluations provided by DAI in its Final Report (DAI, 1991) for the first period of its contract in response to a question about negative aspects of their programs.

"...not being able to attend a school of my preference, not because I was not able to get in, but because of a lack of attention from my placement officers."

"...the way that we were handled in the Dominican Republic before the program started and the first five months after it started. Mrs....was not very careful with the way that she handled our papers and applications. We arrived in Washington and most of the paperwork we had filled out three months before was lost or misplaced."

#### **F. LESSONS LEARNED**

- **Training Impact is Directly Related to the Amount of Funding Invested in It.**

Overseas, long-term training has the highest impact, but is by far the most expensive. This type of training impacts on the professional formation of participants as well as on their technical performance. The principles and orientation to their professional and to their work environment, which they acquired during the training, had important long-term effects on their careers, and on their employer institutions.

- **High Quality, In-Country Training Capacity is Available.**

Local institutions provided excellent training under DETRA. This was more true of courses which lasted for one week or more. These courses were strengthened, as were the sponsoring institutions, by the incorporation of appropriate international personnel into the course offerings. This capacity is found in Santo Domingo as well as in the interior of the country. Part of this training capacity is found in the NGO community.

- **Training Should be Targeted on Economic Sectors rather than on Specific Institutions/Enterprises.**

Considerable job mobility occurred among participants upon return from their training. This was most notable for those who

undertook long-term and overseas training. In some cases, their sponsoring institutions went out of business. In other cases, they provided returned participants with unsatisfactory jobs. Participants found that they had highly valued and marketable skills upon return. Many accepted more attractive job offers.

Most of the mobility which occurred, however, took place within the same economic sector in which training was provided. For example, some Central Bank-sponsored participants took jobs with private banks; some professors of agriculture took jobs with other agribusiness firms; and some NGO employees took jobs with other NGOs in the same sector. Future training should focus on manpower resource needs of sectors, rather than firms, to facilitate this type of job mobility, while at the same time, maximizing returns from investments in training.

- **Enterprise Training Plans do not Work Well in the Dominican Republic.**

Alternative organizational approaches to training in the Dominican Republic should be considered and implemented. Many of the firms participating in the training were small and relatively new. They had limited capacity to complete good training plans. Training candidates actually made major contributions to the preparation of ETPs, but this resulted in their own personal training preferences, rather than the needs of the sponsoring firms, being reflected in them.

Several additional limiting factors were: (1) that there is less of a tradition of working with training plans in the Dominican private sector; (2) that many firms are family owned and operated, and desire primarily to send family members for training; (3) that many private sector firms are on shaky economic footing, and are concerned with solving short-term problems rather than long-term problems; and (4) that in the Latin American culture, there is a tendency to focus on individual rather than organizational needs.

As a result of these conditions, many firms defined the ETP as an application requirement rather than as a planning tool; many were poorly done, and therefore of marginal use in defining training needs; and many tended to focus on needs of participants rather than their employers.

- **Equity/Efficiency Parameters Determine Different Types of Training Programs.**

Programs that are designed to provide training to private sector firms, in order to strengthen them, are more likely to emphasize efficiency goals. Programs that are not designed to provide institutional strengthening are more likely to emphasize equity goals. Private Sector firms, particularly family owned and

operated firms, are more likely to support the overseas training of family members, who later become managers and decision makers in the firm. These individuals are more likely to be of middle or upper class origin. However, training of these individuals is more likely to lead to higher payoff for the firms. These participants are more likely to return after training and are more likely to remain with the sponsoring firm.

Short-term training, particularly in-country training, is more likely to incorporate individuals of lower economic means. This training places fewer economic demands on sponsoring institutions, and the training is more accessible to individuals who may have no formal affiliation with institutions in the private sector.

- **Complex Project Management Structures Reduce Program Efficiency and Create Additional Work for other Participating Institutions.**

DETRA had two in-country management entities -- CNHE and FUNDAPEC. Operationally, this implied that USAID duplicated its management and oversight responsibilities. This resulted in additional monetary and personnel management costs. Management costs were primarily borne by the General Development Office and the Controllers Office. In part this structure resulted from shifts in USAID Mission priorities. CNHE was originally contracted to access the private sector, consistent with project objectives. When training was also shifted to the public and NGO sectors, there was a need to define an intermediary that worked with these sectors. A subcontract arrangement, using only one primary contractor, could have avoided some of the additional cost and management burdens.

- **Long-term Projects Require Design Flexibility to Facilitate Adaptation to Changing Circumstances.**

DETRA was designed as an eight year project. During its life, many changes occurred in the Dominican economy, and in AID priorities. These changes led to changes in the focus of training. Adaptation to the changing circumstances would have been less difficult, if greater flexibility had been introduced to the project design. It may be appropriate in the future to tie training to Mission Strategic Objectives and to specific projects. This would permit resources to flow in forms that are consistent with changing priorities.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Several recommendations that are relevant to future training activities of the USAID Mission are found below.



- USAID should maintain a portfolio of overseas training, particularly long-term training, because it results in greatest impact on national economic and social development.
- USAID should incorporate activities which strengthen higher education institutions into in-country training programs. Substantial quality, in-country training capacity currently exists. This should be nurtured to increase the magnitude of training investments.
- Increased attention should be given to strengthening administrative, managerial and sustainability dimensions of Dominican NGOs and PVOs which participate in the current USAID project portfolio. These institutions require this training in order to become sustainable over time.

**APPENDIX**

**SCOPE OF WORK FOR EVALUATION**

The project purpose was to "increase the number of trained professional, technical, and managerial personnel needed to meet the manpower demands of an export-oriented economy". The planned outputs were 8 PhD level programs for university faculty members, 55 Masters level academic programs, and 250 persons attending short-term technical programs. All training was to take place in the U.S. or third countries and, with the exception of the university professors, all participants were to be from private sector, export-oriented companies.

The project was amended in 1988 to add an additional \$8 million worth of funding, for a total of \$15 million, and expand the project purpose to allow training of employees of public sector and non-profit organizations and to include opportunities for in-country training. The estimated number of PhD programs was reduced to 3, the total number of Master's level training increased to 90 and overseas short-term trainees increased to 400. An estimated 80 in-country workshops were envisioned, with an average attendance of 30 persons.

The project design specifies that all training must not only be in priority Mission strategic objective fields, but also that it be planned in the context of organizational training needs. Each participating firm or institution was expected to complete an Enterprise Training Plan (ETP), which should include an analytical review of training needs upon which to base a training plan. A mid-term evaluation in 1990 concluded that the ETPs were difficult for most firms to complete adequately and that for the majority of the participants they were considered to be an application requirement rather than a planning tool. Some changes were made in the ETP process after this evaluation.

In 1992 contracts were signed by the two grantees under this project with the Technical Secretariat of the Presidency (TSP or STP) to finance training under the Local Currency Program, as local currency counterpart funds for the project. The amount of \$2 million pesos were made available to each grantee to reach the following objectives: The Consejo Nacional de Hombres de Empresa were to provide seven (7) in-country courses with 175 trainees. The Fundación Apec de Crédito Educativo's goal was fifteen (15) in-country courses with an estimate of 20-30 trainees per course.

Background documents are available which will provide an ample perspective of the project results to date. These include, but are not limited to:

- a. Interim Evaluation, Project No. 517-0216, dated August 1990
- b. Impact Evaluation, Project No. 517-0216, dated June 1992.
- (c.) Copies of Mission Semi-Annual Review reports.
- (d.) Copies of technical assistance contractor's quarterly reports.
- (e.) Copies of Grantees' Project Evaluation reports.

## 2. Scope of Work

The project will be assessed on two levels: 1) trainees's achievement of their specific objectives for using the training in their employer organization, and 2) resulting changes in the organization that contributed to the project goals.

The evaluation team will carry out the following tasks:

- a. Review the project documents and other important background materials.
- (b.) Review actual versus planned outputs, the purpose and the goal of the project.
- c. Meet with project participants and beneficiaries to assess how the project has assisted them.
- (d.) Review the role of the technical assistance and assess the performance of the contractor under this project.
- (e.) Review the actual versus planned outputs, the purpose and the goal of the Local Currency Component under this project.
- f. Review overall accomplishments in terms of:
  - OK -Sector of employment (public, private, NGO)
  - OK -Type of training (academic, technical, in-country)
  - OK -Nature of technical training (general survey, product or industry specific)
  - Gender of trainees by sector, type of training and nature of training.
  - OK -Applicability and utilization of training received.

P.O. No. 517-0216-O-00-5124-00  
Mr. David Hansen  
Page 4

## ARTICLE II - PERIOD OF SERVICE

The contractor will provide services for a period of 30 days beginning o/a February 22, 1995 and ending o/a April 7, 1995. A six day work week is authorized. Contractor will travel to the D.R. from February 22 through February 28, 1995; will return to the U.S.A. during the following two weeks while the field work would be conducted; and return on March 24 through April 7, 1995 to do work in country.

The period of service of this Purchase Order may be modified to meet Mission requirements.

## ARTICLE III - DELIVERABLES

a. The evaluation team will attend an entrance meeting, coordinated by the USAID/DR project officer, with designated USAID/DR officials. Additionally, a written list of issues, with a proposed plan and methodology for the evaluation, along with an evaluation schedule shall be submitted to the USAID/DR Project Officer by the COB of the second day in-country of the evaluation team.

b. The evaluators will submit four (4) copies of the Evaluation Report draft and the filled out A.I.D. Evaluation Summary (AID Form 1330-5/(10-871)) 24 hours prior to a final debriefing meeting to be held with USAID/DR. After the debriefing meeting, four (4) copies of the revised Evaluation Report draft shall be submitted to USAID/DR prior the evaluation team's departure from the Dominican Republic.

c. Fifteen (15) copies in English and eight (8) copies in Spanish of the final evaluation report and three copies of the completed A.I.D. Evaluation Summary form, plus WordPerfect 5.1 software containing the evaluation and the summary, must be received by USAID/DR within three weeks after the team's departure from the Dominican Republic.

## ARTICLE IV - RELATIONSHIP AND RESPONSIBILITIES

a) The contractor will work under the technical direction of the USAID/DR A/General Development Officer, Ms. Christine Adamczyk, and/or her designee.

b) The Cooperative Country Liaison Officials are the Executive Director of FUNDAPEC, and the Executive Director of the Consejo Nacional de Hombres de Empresa (CNHE).

ARTICLE V - PAYMENTS

- a) The total amount of this Purchase Order is [REDACTED]. A fixed price of [REDACTED]. This amount shall be requested from the U.S. Reimbursement Office upon receipt of the proper invoice accompanied by a completed US Government Form SF-1034.
- b) The contractor is authorized to subcontract a local firm to undertake a field survey. The ceiling amount for this survey is [REDACTED]. This amount will be paid on a cost reimbursable basis upon submission of invoice with proper supporting documentation.
- c) The contractor will receive two payments in the amount of [REDACTED] as follows: one first payment by April 1, 1995 upon submission of an interim report; and a second payment upon delivery and acceptance of the final product deliverables as stated in the Scope of Work.
- d) The contractor's invoice shall be supported by a written statement from the cognizant Project Officer verifying the completion and acceptance of the required deliverables.

**DETRA LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX**



**PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY  
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

Life of Project : \$12.7 million  
Total U.S. Funding : \$ 9.5 million  
Date Prepared : August 1, 1988

Project Title & Number: Development Training (317-0216) Amendment

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions																												
<p><b>Goal</b> To improve the Human Resources base required for economic growth and development.</p>	<p><b>A.1</b></p> <p>A trained pool of professional managers and technicians in key sectors of the economy.</p>	<p><b>A.3</b></p> <p>1) Reports of the Central Bank and IBRD 2) IMF Economic Memorandum 3) Reports by the National Council of Businessmen (CNIE).</p>	<p><b>A.4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Private sector willing to re-orient its activities</li> <li>- GOOR will support export-led growth with appropriate policies</li> <li>- Political stability and economic growth will continue.</li> </ul>																												
<p><b>PURPOSE</b></p> <p>To increase the number of trained professional, tech., and managerial personnel needed to meet the manpower demands of an export-oriented economy.</p> <p>To improve the efficiency and productivity of the private and public sector institutions and organizations supportive of USAID's strategy by providing training to Dominicans already employed.</p>	<p><b>B.2 End of Project Status</b></p> <p>1) Improved productive capacity and expanded export marketing in the participating enterprises.</p> <p>2) Improved graduate-level curriculum in the priority areas of study related to private sector economic development.</p> <p>3) Improved and more effective private sector communications network to plan and coordinate training requirements at the national level and for the individual firm.</p> <p>4) Improved communication channels between private and public sectors.</p>	<p><b>B.3</b></p> <p>1) Records of AID and the training organizations 2) Participant tracking systems 3) Project evaluations.</p>	<p><b>B.4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Private sector firms recognize need for upgrading of employee skills.</li> <li>- Employees view further training as factor in job enhancement</li> <li>- Certain public sector institutions supportive of private sector growth.</li> </ul>																												
<p><b>OUTPUTS</b></p> <p>1) Long-term Graduate Trng. in the U.S. and third countries;</p> <p>2) Short-term U.S. and 3rd. country training.</p> <p>3) In-country seminars and workshops.</p>	<p><b>C.2 Output Indicators</b></p> <p>1) An estimated 90 private sector and public sector employees trained at the Master's level in the U.S. or Third Countries</p> <p>2) Some 400 employees sent for short-term U.S. or 3rd Country courses or observational programs.</p> <p>3) Approximately 2000 Dominicans attending in-country seminars and workshops.</p>	<p><b>C.3</b></p> <p>1) Reports from the universities &amp; training institutions 2) Feedback from students 3) Feedback from firms 4) Contractor's reports 5) Participant tracking system.</p>	<p><b>C.4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Private sector firms will financially support employees in training.</li> <li>- Availability of qualified candidates.</li> <li>- Local institutions have facilities and capabilities for organizing seminars and workshops.</li> </ul>																												
<p><b>Inputs</b></p> <p>Training</p> <p>a) U.S. LT</p> <p>b) U.S., 3rd Country ST and in-country</p> <p>c) ELT</p> <p>Project Management</p>	<p><b>D.2 Budget (\$000)</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>AID</th><th>HCC</th><th>TOTAL</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1)</td><td>7,675</td><td>2,100</td><td>9,775</td></tr> <tr> <td>a.</td><td>4,500</td><td>1,000</td><td>5,500</td></tr> <tr> <td>b.</td><td>3,025</td><td>1,000</td><td>4,025</td></tr> <tr> <td>c.</td><td>150</td><td>100</td><td>250</td></tr> <tr> <td>2)</td><td>1,825</td><td>1,100</td><td>2,925</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td><td><b>9,500</b></td><td><b>3,200</b></td><td><b>12,700</b></td></tr> </tbody> </table>		AID	HCC	TOTAL	1)	7,675	2,100	9,775	a.	4,500	1,000	5,500	b.	3,025	1,000	4,025	c.	150	100	250	2)	1,825	1,100	2,925	<b>Total</b>	<b>9,500</b>	<b>3,200</b>	<b>12,700</b>	<p><b>D.3</b></p> <p>AID Records Counterpart Records.</p>	<p><b>D.4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Availability of AID funds</li> <li>- Availability of local currency counterpart funds.</li> <li>- Continuation of in-country ELT program.</li> </ul>
	AID	HCC	TOTAL																												
1)	7,675	2,100	9,775																												
a.	4,500	1,000	5,500																												
b.	3,025	1,000	4,025																												
c.	150	100	250																												
2)	1,825	1,100	2,925																												
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,500</b>	<b>3,200</b>	<b>12,700</b>																												

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY  
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Life of Project : \$9.1 million  
Total U.S. Funding: \$7.0 million  
Date Prepared : 6/23/86

Project Title & Number: Development Training (517-0216)

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions															
<u>Goal</u> To improve the Human Resources base required for private sector export-led growth and development.	A.2 A trained pool of professional managers and technicians in key sectors of the economy.	A.3 1) Reports of the Central Bank and IBRD 2) IMF Economic Memorandum 3) Reports by the National Council of Businessmen (CNIE).	A.4 - Private sector willing to re-orient its activities - GOCR will support export-led growth with appropriate policies - Political stability and economic growth will continue.															
<u>Purpose</u> To increase the number of trained professional, tech., and managerial personnel needed to meet the manpower demands of an export-oriented economy.	B.2 End of Project Status 1) Improved productive capacity and expanded export marketing in the participating enterprises. 2) Improved graduate-level curriculum in the priority areas of study related to private sector economic development. 3) Improved and more effective private sector communications network to plan and coordinate training requirements at the national level and for the individual firm.	B.3 1) Records of AID and the training organizations 2) Participant tracking systems 3) Project evaluations.	B.4 - Employment opportunities exist for trained personnel.															
<u>Outputs</u> (1) Long-term Graduate Trng. in the U.S. and third countries; (2) Short-term U.S. and 3rd. country training.	C.2 Output Indicators 1) An estimated 55 private sector employees trained at the Master's level in the U.S. or Third Countries. 2) An estimated 8 university faculty members trained at the PhD or Masters level in the U.S. 3) An estimated 250 private sector employees trained in short-term U.S. or 3rd. Country courses or observational visits.	C.3 1) Reports from the universities & training institutions 2) Feedback from students 3) Feedback from firms 4) Contractor's reports 5) Participant tracking system.	C.4 - Private sector firms will financially support employees in training.															
<u>Inputs</u>  1) Training  2) Project Administrative Costs  3) Project Evaluation/Audit	D.2 Budget (\$000) <table><thead><tr><th></th><th>AID</th><th>HCC</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1) Training</td><td>5,461,700</td><td>2,100,000</td></tr><tr><td>2) Project Administrative Costs</td><td>1,403,300</td><td>303,000</td></tr><tr><td>3) Project Evaluation/Audit</td><td>85,000</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>7,000,000</td><td>2,403,000</td></tr></tbody></table>		AID	HCC	1) Training	5,461,700	2,100,000	2) Project Administrative Costs	1,403,300	303,000	3) Project Evaluation/Audit	85,000	-		7,000,000	2,403,000	D.3 AID Records Counterpart Records.	D.4 - Availability of AID funds - Availability of local currency counterpart organization.
	AID	HCC																
1) Training	5,461,700	2,100,000																
2) Project Administrative Costs	1,403,300	303,000																
3) Project Evaluation/Audit	85,000	-																
	7,000,000	2,403,000																

**REFERENCES**

Brohl, Allan

- 1990 Establishment of a Returned Participant Alumni Association.  
Prepared for USAID/Dominican Republic, Project #511-0584.  
March.

Chiriboga, Douglas

- 1994 Memorandum to Lic. Roberto E. Liz. March 8.

Consejo Nacional de Hombres de Empresa

- 1994 DETRA: Informe Semestral (Enero a Junio, 1994), Santo Domingo:  
CNHE.

Development Associates, Inc.

- 1989 Technical Assistance for the Development Training Project, RFP  
No. DR-899-004. Arlington, Va.: DAI.

- 1991 Summary Final Report "July 16, 1987 - July 30, 1991 on USAID  
Contract 517-0216 "Dominican Republic Development Training I  
Project. Arlington, Va.: DAI.

- 1994 Dominican Republic Development Training Project II: Final  
Report. Arlington, Va.: DAI.

El Secretariado Tecnico de la Presidencia

- 1992 "Contrato e Prestamo entre El Secretariado Tecnico de la  
Presidencia (STP) y Consejo Nacional de Hombres de Empresa,  
Inc. (CNHE)." May 27.

- 1992 "Enmienda No. 1 Al Contrato e Prestamo entre El Secretariado  
Tecnico de la Presidencia (STP) y Consejo Nacional de Hombres  
de Empresa, Inc. (CNHE) de Fecha 27 de mayo de 1992." December  
17.

- 1992 "Contrato de Prestamo entre El Secretariado Tecnico de la  
Presidencia (STP) y Fundacion APEC de Credito Educativo, Inc.  
(FUNDAPEC)." May 27.

FUNDAPEC (Fundacion APEC de Credito Educativo), Inc.

- 1994 Proyecto Entrenamiento para el Desarrollo (DETRA): Informe  
Final - Seguimiento de Egresados (Preliminar). Santo Domingo:  
FUNDAPEC, 21 de agosto.

Gonzalez, Luis C.

- 1995 Memorandum to Christine Adamczyk/Amelia Ramirez. January 4.

Hansen, David O.

1993 Impact Assessment: Development Training Project. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, June.

Instituto Superior de Agricultura (CADER)

1993 Evaluacion del Impacto del Proyecto "Entrenamiento para el Desarrollo (DETRA)" Ejecutado por la Fundacion APED (FUNDAPEC). Santo Domingo: FUNDAPEC, June.

Luciano Lopez, Olga.

1994 Evaluacion de Impacto del Proyecto Entrenamiento para el Desarrollo (DETRA) del Consejo Nacional de Hombres de Empresa (CNHE) y la Agencia Internacional para el Desarrollo (AID). Santo Domingo: CNHE, junio agosto.

Murphy F., Martin and Maricela Ramirez

1988 Evaluation of the Impact of USAID/DR Foreign Training Program and Opinions of Returned Participants. Santo Domingo: USAID/ Human Resources Division, July.

Renforth, William

1990 Midterm Evaluation of Development Training Project. Final Report. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development.

USAID/Dominican Republic

1986 Development Training Project Paper. USAID/Dominican Republic, Santo Domingo: USAID Mission.

1988 Development Training Project Paper: Amendment No. 4. USAID/ Dominican Republic, Santo Domingo: USAID Mission.

"DETRA Grant Letter to FUNDAPEC President Dr. Marcelino San Miguel II." Santo Domingo: USAID Mission, August 24.

"DETRA Amendment 4 Letter to National Council of Businessmen President Jose del Carmen Ariza," Santo Domingo, USAID, 8/24.

1992 Development Training Project Status Report (October, 1991 - March, 1992). Santo Domingo: USAID Mission.

1994 Dominican Republic Action Plan (FY 1993-1994). Dominican Republic: USAID, June.

1994 Project Status Report (April, 1994 - September, 1994). USAID/Dominican Republic, GDO Office.

**PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

**I. USAID**

- \* Michael Deal, Deputy Mission Director
- \* Christine Adamczyk, Chief, General Development Office
- \* Amelia Ramirez, Training Officer
- \* Thelma Camarena, Program Manager
- \* Wayne Butler, Controller
- \* John Thomas, Special Assistant to Mission Director
- \* Henry Welhous, Project Development Office
- \* Luis Gonzalez, Evaluation Officer
- \* Efrain Laureano, Project Manager
- \* Maritza Rodriguez, Controller's Office
- \* Marina Tavares, Project Development Office
- \* Manuel Ortega, Project Officer

**II. RETURNED PARTICIPANTS**

- \* Ramon Mejia, R.H. Mejia and Co., C. x A.
- \* Evaydee Perez S., Public Communications Officer, Fundacion PRONATURA
- \* Luis Reyes, Deputy Director Dept. of Monetary Programming and Economic Research, Central Bank
- \* Sergio Grullon, Vice President and Treasurer, Agricentro, Inc., C. x A.
- \* Cristina Thomen, Administrative Assistant, Dominican Stock Market
- \* Francisco Mendez, Professor, Instituto Superior de Agricultura
- \* Jose Alfredo Guerrero, Department of Monetary Programming and Economic Research, Central Bank

**II. FORMER PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS**

- \* Roberto Liz, Executive Director, FUNDAPEC
- \* Rafael Alba, Former Program Manager FUNDAPEC
- \* Alicia Tejada, Former Assistant Program Manager, FUNDAPEC
- \* Frank Castillo, Executive Director, CNHE
- \* Carmen Salce, Former Program Manager, CNHE



**INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE USED**

## INTERVIEWS

## RETURNED PARTICIPANTS

## BACKGROUND:

- \* Name \_\_\_\_\_
- \* Type of Training Received \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- \* Where Training Received \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- \* Employer before training \_\_\_\_\_
- \* Employer after training \_\_\_\_\_

## IMPACT OF TRAINING:

- \* Is your salary higher than it was before training? \_\_\_\_\_  
Did training contribute to increase? \_\_\_\_\_  
How important was training for salary? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- \* Do you have better job status now? \_\_\_\_\_  
As a consequence of training? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- \* Did the training make you more employable? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- \* Are you applying what you learned? \_\_\_\_\_  
How is it being applied? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- \* Have you helped to make changes in your employer institution?

What have these changes been? \_\_\_\_\_

- \* Do you believe that the training will help you in your future career and employment? \_\_\_\_\_

Please Explain \_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATION OF SUPPORT FOR PROGRAM:**

- \* Do you have any particular complaints about the program (either about USAID, Development Associates, etc?) \_\_\_\_\_

Please expand \_\_\_\_\_

- \* If you were in charge of a future program, how would you make it different? \_\_\_\_\_

- \* What was the most positive aspect of the program? \_\_\_\_\_

- \* What was the most negative aspect of the program? \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you